

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 199 476

CE 028 277

AUTHOR Murphy, Bruce: Pawasarat, John
 TITLE Youth Unemployment and Undereducation: What Approaches Work? Research Paper No. 1.
 INSTITUTION Wisconsin Univ., Milwaukee. Univ. Extension.
 PUB DATE May 80
 NOTE 91p.
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; Basic Skills; Case Studies; *Educational Attainment; Educational Research; Education Work Relationship; Employment Programs; Job Placement; Models; National Programs; Program Descriptions; *Program Effectiveness; Reentry Students; Remedial Instruction; Success; Supervision; Surveys; *Unemployment; *Youth; *Youth Employment; *Youth Programs

ABSTRACT

A study identified and analyzed successful national youth projects which have the highest job placement rates, the highest rate of returning youths to school, and the most effective combination of basic skills remediation and job placement. The analysis and identification was based on a summary of literature; discussions with local, state, and national officials involved with youth employment; and site visits to eight exemplary youth projects (in Boston, Baltimore, Berkeley, Philadelphia, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Seattle, and San Francisco). Results of the study highlighted programs which return youth to school; provide remedial education and job placement; and involve cooperation among the prime sponsor, the local education agency (LEA), and the private sector. Factors linked to program success include tying academics directly to work experience; reinforcing attendance at school with paid work experience; career education, career awareness, and job preparation workshops; well-supervised job sites; and careful monitoring of programs through performance-based contracts, centralized intake, assessment, and pre- and posttesting. (The final chapter contains summaries of the eight case studies. Each summary provides information on in- and out-of-school programs, the prime sponsor, linkages with LEAs, private sector involvement, and program staff. A bibliography is appended.) (MN)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT AND UNDER EDUCATION:

WHAT APPROACHES WORK?

Bruce Murphy
and
John Pawasarat

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Lerman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Employment and Training Institute
Division of Urban Outreach
University of Wisconsin-Extension

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Throughout the three months during which this study was conducted numerous individuals and agencies cooperated in each phase of the project. The financial support and direction from Cyrena Fenderson and the Governor's Employment and Training Office are gratefully acknowledged.

In particular we would like to thank the staff members of the Prime Sponsors, Local Educational Agencies, and Community Based Organizations in each of the eight cities we visited. Their hospitality, cooperation, and willingness to share the success of their programs are the foundation of this report.

During the original stages of research and the compilation of data, we received significant contributions of both time and energy from the individuals and agencies listed in the appendix. Without their generosity and previous research our compilation of findings would never have been possible.

Finally, a special note of appreciation to Mark Warhus for his assistance on our first site visit and to Philip E. Lerman, Employment and Training Institute Co-Director, for his advice and encouragement throughout the project.

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING INSTITUTE STAFF

Bill Durkin
Wilma Knowles
Mary Mulroy
Bruce Murphy
John Pawasarat



University of Wisconsin System

EMPLOYMENT & TRAINING INSTITUTE

W. LEE HANSEN
DIRECTOR

P.O. BOX 410 MILWAUKEE WISCONSIN 53240

PHILIP L. JERMAN
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

OVERVIEW

YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT AND UNDEREDUCATION: WHAT APPROACHES WORK?

This report was commissioned by the Governor's Employment and Training Office of the State of Wisconsin. The assignment was to complete a time limited, three month investigation focusing on programs for 16 to 18 year olds with the highest rates of job placement, the highest rates of returning youth to school and the most successful combination of remedial education and job placement. Programs outside of Wisconsin with potential for replication in this state were to be studied.

Eight programs were ultimately identified as notable efforts possessing exemplary characteristics worthy of replication. This report is based on site visits to these programs, located in the following cities: Baltimore, Berkeley, Boston, Minneapolis, Philadelphia, St. Paul, San Francisco, and Seattle. Our conclusions were buttressed by information obtained through a review of relevant literature, and contacts made with various officials involved with youth programs across the nation.

Descriptions of the exemplary programs are organized into five areas: Out-of-school programs, in-school programs, prime sponsor, linkages with the LEA, and the private sector. The findings for all eight cities are consolidated by program area (in-school, prime sponsor, et .) in Chapter Three and separated by city in Chapter Four, for the reader convenience. Part Four of Chapter Two is a review of the literature organized in the same fashion as the Chapter Three findings, thereby crystallizing the critical issues.

This report was completed by employees of the Employment and Training Institute of the University of Wisconsin-Extension. The Institute, created as a coordinating vehicle of University programming in the manpower training and human resource development fields, originates and coordinates research, training, technical assistance, and demonstration projects.

The opinions in this report are not necessarily those of the Governor's Employment and Training Office and are the sole responsibility of the authors.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained by writing to the above address.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

THE PROJECT The Governor's Employment and Training Office contracted with the Employment and Training Institute to identify and analyze successful national youth projects which have the highest job placement rates, the highest rate of returning youths to school and the most effective combination of basic skills remediation and job placement.

THE METHODOLOGY The analysis and identification of successful programs were based on a survey of literature, discussions with local, state, and national officials involved with youth employment, and site visits to the eight exemplary youth projects: Boston, Baltimore, Berkeley, Philadelphia, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Seattle, and San Francisco.

KEY FINDINGS Results of the study highlight programs which return youth to school, provide remedial education and job placement and involve cooperation between the Prime Sponsor, the LEA, and Private Sector.

- Successful Out-of-School Programs offer a non-traditional education setting with strong emphasis on remedial education, counseling, and supportive services. Academics need to be directly tied to work experience, reinforcing attendance at school with the carrot of 20 hours paid work experience, and through career education and well-supervised job sites. A CBO or alternative school is most commonly the program operator. Programs tend to offer half day work. Direct CETA costs are higher due to increased supportive services but may be less than in-school programs when combined with per pupil costs of education through the LEA.
- Successful In-School Programs supplement after school work experience with career awareness and job preparation workshops and use the job placement as leverage to increase attendance and performance in school. Counselors monitor job sites regularly and are responsible for the school/work linkage. Remedial education, when it occurs, is most often a function of the regular in-school curriculum.
- Prime Sponsors have increased their capacity to monitor program success and quality through performance based contracts, centralized intake, assessment, and pre and post testing, and close communication with the LEA. Successful linkage with the LEA has resulted in coordinated programming, and the bartering of additional funds (ex. State Aids) using CETA as a match.
- Private Sector cooperation which results in job placements has involved full or partial subsidy plans and most often occurs in smaller businesses. Close supervision and follow-up after CETA funds are withdrawn are necessary to insure success.

Adequate staff and prior experience characterized successful programs. In-school programs use unionized teachers and counselors while CBO salaries vary with the organization.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements		i
Overview		iii
Executive Summary		v
Acronyms and Abbreviations		viii
Chapter One:	<u>Methodology</u>	1
	Objective of Study and Assumptions	
	Initial Analysis and Collection of Data	
	Selection Process	
	Survey Instruments	
	Site Visits	
Chapter Two:	<u>Introduction and Review of Literature</u>	11
	Dimensions of the Problem	
	Relationship Between Youth Unemployment and Undereducation	
	Youth Programs: General Overview	
	Youth Programs: Specific Approaches	
Chapter Three:	<u>Review of Findings</u>	37
	Out-of-School Programs	
	In-School Programs	
	Prime Sponsor	
	Linkages with LEA	
	Private Sector	
Chapter Four:	<u>Eight Case Studies</u>	55
	Baltimore	
	Berkeley	
	Boston	
	Minneapolis	
	Philadelphia	
	St. Paul	
	San Francisco	
	Seattle	
Appendix:	A. Bibliography	A-1
	B. List of organizations providing information or assistance.	B-1

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CBO	Community Based Organization
CETA	Comprehensive Employment and Training Act
Entitlement	Youth Incentive and Entitlement Pilot Project
LEA	Local Education Agency
NYC	Neighborhood Youth Corps.
PIC	Private Industry Council
Prime	Prime Sponsor
YCCIP	Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Projects
YEDPA	Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects
YETP	Youth Employment and Training Program
YIEPP	Youth Incentive and Entitlement Pilot Project

CHAPTER ONE
METHODOLOGY

PART 1. OBJECTIVE OF STUDY

The purpose of this study was to identify and analyze the most successful national projects with the following characteristics:

- Projects involving the highest rates of placing youths into jobs.
- Projects involving the highest rates of returning youth to school.
- Projects which most effectively combine basic skills remediation with job placements.

The selection process developed was to involve a systematic survey of the universe of available data, detailing the programs which were reviewed in the process of making selections and the steps taken to assure that all available data was included.

For the purposes of this study youth was defined as high school age 16-18. Programs considered were to have some relationship to CETA funded programs now in existence, focusing on the feasibility of replication for Wisconsin municipalities. The study was expected to identify aspects of programs which could render maximum results for minimum changes in existing programs, highlighting the type of staff necessary to carry out programs and what distinguish them from other programs. It was to identify the financial, political and legal factors which led to development of programs, and those programs which impact on the largest portion of the population in need.

The study was to involve on-site visitation and limit itself to cities outside the State of Wisconsin. This study was commissioned in January 1980 with the understanding that findings be submitted by April 1, 1980.

PART 2. ASSUMPTIONS

The Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act (YEDPA) was signed into law on August 5, 1977, creating four new youth programs each representing a different approach for addressing youth employment problems: the Young Adult Conservation Corps (YACC), Youth Employment and Training Programs (YETP), Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Projects (YIEPP), and Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Projects (CCIP). Through YEDPA the quality of existing programs was to be improved with better supervision and increased services. Closer linkages were to result in combined program initiatives between the Prime Sponsor and the LEA. New coordinated programs were expected to involve all relevant

actors, resulting in a dramatic impact on youth unemployment.

YIEPP was perhaps the most ambitious and costly of these programs by size, entitling every youth to a job in each of the 17 target areas identified. Such a massive infusion of federal funds on a scale necessary to address the problems as defined resulted in significant delays, complications, and snafus during the early stages of implementation. While many of the Prime Sponsors were able to eventually piece together successful shotgun marriages between the LEA and Prime, the results of the program are as yet undefined. MDRC is scheduled to come out with some preliminary findings this spring, but most people agree that another year of operation will be necessary before significant data can be released on the success or failure of this program. Certainly many creative approaches and new LEA/Prime Sponsor relationships have resulted. But our analysis of these programs can only assume that these new approaches and linkages are truly as successful as they now seem.

Another problem associated with YETP and YCCIP in determining the effectiveness of youth programs is the lack of standard criteria for measuring success. The determination of what constitutes successful "placements", "negative terminations", "positive terminations", etc., varies and is by no means a reliable method of determining programmatic success.

Secondly, Prime Sponsors have had to shift the use of monies in YETP, YCCIP, SPEDY, and IIB to fit budgetary and program needs, with the result that a given client may be in two or three different categories of programs within an 18 month period, without a change in their job description. Determination of program success under such circumstances is difficult. Certainly identification of most successful programs is removed from the realm of statistical reliability. However, many new linkages between Prime Sponsors and LEA's seem to exist because of the experimentation which these programs have allowed.

While existing program data cannot be used to expressly identify the most successful programs extant, there are a number of indicators which can be used to assess the variety of approaches which have grown out of YEDPA and the indications of success which seem to accompany them. They are as follows:

- A. Successful linkages
- B. Tying school to work
- C. Career education

- D. Alternative Education for dropouts
- E. Basic Skills for In-School Youth

Our first assumption was that we were not the first ones to try this sort of venture and that by finding those who already had done so we could get some idea of what exists.

Secondly, while the project was to focus on 16-18 year olds, the fact that many programs serve a broader population would inevitably mean that the population served might more realistically include 14-21 year olds, with the majority falling in the 16-18 range.

Third, the study would need to focus on efforts to reach those most in need of remedial education and employment skills who are CETA eligible.

Fourth, in-school programs would need to be examined closely, since the largest concentration of illiterates and unskilled youth are in our schools. Moreover, most youth money available is for in-school youth and most efforts at remediation and returning youth to school occur in this context.

Sixth, time constrained us from any original research. Instead we would necessarily have to depend on the judgment of others.

Seventh, because there are no "best" programs it was more prudent to identify a mix of innovative programs which may have mixed success but contain exemplary characteristics with potential for duplication.

PART 3. INITIAL ANALYSIS AND COLLECTION OF DATA

There are a range of government officials, from the Vice President's Task Force to state program monitors who have some ideas about the types of programs which are successful. Their ideas are based on a variety of knowledge levels from direct and ongoing observation to more general assessments of nationwide trends. During the first month of this study we contacted over 30 individuals who were in positions to offer comments about programs which they thought met the criteria outlined for this study. Individuals and organizations contacted are listed in the appendix.

The contacts also generated a list of program abstracts which by the time of selection numbered close to 350. Most abstracts detailed the program's unique objectives, program description, funding source, administrative and staffing requirements, recruitment and client profile, outcomes to date, problems and

progress, implementation hints, and general comments.

In these initial inquiries two programs were mentioned by a wide variety of sources; Baltimore and Boston. Beyond these nationally recognized efforts there seemed to be little unanimity about successful program efforts.

Additionally, letters were sent to the Governor's Employment and Training Office of each state requesting information about model programs which were in existence. However, even with follow-up telephone conversations only four states responded with program descriptions and only one state was willing to identify programs of documented success. Whether due to lack of model programs or reticence to venture comments as to their most successful programs, identification of programs exhibiting success was sorely lacking.

Another source for the identification of model programs was the evaluations done on YEDPA programs to date. However, as mentioned earlier, no conclusive research has been done on any of these programs through MDRC or Youthwork. In particular, no designation of specific programs as the "best" programs has been attempted. At least another year of operation seems necessary before enough participant data is available for adequate analysis.

One thing which became clear in collecting data on model programs, was the interest all contacted parties had in the study which we were conducting. Apparently no one has had the data, courage and/or arrogance to identify YEDPA programs which are truly successful, much less programs which could be considered model programs.

In contacting individuals and organizations we asked for any additional contacts we should pursue which might prove valuable in identifying youth programs in the three areas specified. After exhausting all contacts, federal agencies, and existing literature (with at least one contact made to every state in the union) we had amassed a universe of programs throughout the United States which numbered close to 350.

PART 4. SELECTION PROCESS

The collection of close to 350 descriptions of youth programs was completed March 1, 1980, within a month and a half after the study began. The process of selection of exemplary programs was grounded on the three areas of concentration outlined in the purpose of this study and the previously listed assumptions which arose out of discussions with the Governor's Employment and Training Office.

To determine the degree to which programs met these criteria, each of the 350 programs was then screened. An initial screening identified those programs which primarily served 16-18 year old populations, had programming which involved the LEA, and demonstrated some feasibility of replication, for each of the three areas of concentration.

This initial screening revealed that few programs were mentioned which addressed returning youths to school, or provided remedial education in combination with job placement. Most programs mentioned did include job placement. Most offered work experience in some form, but only a few combined it with career education, OJT, or tied school attendance and performance to the student's job placement. After reducing the initial 350 programs through a screening process, each remaining program was reviewed in the context of recommendations made by the contacts identified in the initial inquiries. If a program was verified as successful by at least two independent sources, it was selected as a potential exemplary project. Additionally, if a city had more than one of their programs identified as potentially successful in one or more areas of concentration, they were also included as a potential exemplary project.

Meanwhile, an ongoing survey of the literature on youth employment yielded some guideposts to what characterized successful programs. Many of these factors are cited in the second chapter on the definition of the problem, and were incorporated into the final selection process. The review of the literature was a dynamic process which continued to influence all phases of this study and, in turn, was shaped and refined as the project went on. A complete listing of the literature reviewed is found in the Bibliography (Appendix A), while Chapter Two provides a detailed analysis of the literature.

Almost immediately it became obvious that Baltimore and Boston would be included in the study due to the national acclaim each had received for their programs. In addition, two other entitlement programs were identified which were mentioned as having significant exemplary programs: Berkeley and the King-Snohomish Consortium. The other programs selected which met the criteria outlined above were also recommended by at least two other sources. The programs selected were operating projects in at least two of the three areas of concentration and met the criteria of selection previously outlined.

PART 5. THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

During the identification and selection process attention was also focused on the development of a survey instrument which would be used in studying each of the exemplary programs during the on site visits which were to occur. During the month of March development of the survey was focused on three major categories of program data common to each of the visitation sites and areas of concentration detailed in the previous sections. The previous phases of the project - conversations with youth program officials, checking of youth program descriptions, and the review of literature - helped shape the survey instrument.

The first portion of the survey was a prime sponsor questionnaire which asked for the demographic information of the prime sponsor target areas, budgets, factors which contributed to the success or failure of cooperative ventures with the LEA and CBO's, and the type of assistance provided to the LEA's and CBO's by the prime sponsor.

The second section of the survey was designed as a questionnaire for the youth program operator, whether a LEA, CBO, or prime sponsor. It requested data on each program operated that included budget breakdowns by source and category, enrollment and attendance data, program history and background, and a detailed description of any programs of: remedial education, job placement, vocational exploration, career classroom/vocational education, youth operated projects or businesses, counseling and supportive services. It also included a series of general program questions on overall successes and failures.

The third portion of the survey solicited information from the prime sponsor on background data of officials who were important in implementing the program, hiring practices of the prime, a history of LEA/Prime cooperation, and a description of why the program was successful.

Each section of the questionnaires requested data on the feasibility of replication, waivers granted, unique aspects of the locality, and improvements which were made that increased the success of the program in question.

The questionnaires were done during the on site visit by the interviewer. While the survey instrument was most comprehensive, its length and detail (25 pages and over 1,000 possible items) proved too much for prime sponsor staff. Data collection quality varied by city and was complicated by a reticence of some youth program officials to release detailed budgets and enrollment statistics.

However, the questionnaire was to assure uniformity as far as topics covered by the two researchers during the data collection process.

PART 6. SITE VISITS

Prior to the decision to make arrangements for site visits to the eight exemplary programs, a final assessment was made on each city which involved a check of all existing abstracts and program related material to affirm the information on which the initial decision had been made. Additionally, the Newsbank Data Bank at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee was used to access all newspaper articles for the last two years which dealt with youth employment for each of the cities chosen. After gathering all available information on the programs the decision was made to visit the Minneapolis and St. Paul youth programs.

The initial visit was conducted to assure the reliability of survey instrument and to make the necessary modifications before using it in the other six cities identified as exemplary programs. The visit was made by both researchers to insure that the format, approach and content of each completed survey was as uniform as possible and that both of the researchers would be aware of any problems or complications which may have arisen in traveling to the other sites. Upon completion of the Minneapolis and St. Paul site visits, arrangements were made for one researcher to visit Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, while the other was to visit San Francisco, Berkeley, and Seattle. The visitations were begun the week of the 17th of March and were completed on March 27th.

The actual visit consisted of two days of interviews and tours of the program in each city. While the schedule and format of interviews varied by city, each included at least one interview with prime sponsor staff, LEA staff for the youth program, and one project which provided service for out of school youths. The staff in all cities were generally very cooperative, but in some cases did not have sufficient time to answer all questions or designated subordinate staff to handle the questions. This was a factor in the total quantity and quality of information collected.

All information collected was reviewed and discussed. A decision was made to organize the characteristics of the exemplary programs into five areas:

(1) out-of-school programs, (2) in-school programs, (3) prime sponsors, (4) LEA, and (5) the private sector. This is found in Chapter Three. Moreover, for

purposes of clarity and simplification, this same order of presentation was followed in Chapter Two, the review of the literature. Interview results, descriptions of the projects and program highlights resulting from the site visit process are described in greater detail in Chapter Four.

CHAPTER TWO

INTRODUCTION AND REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

"We are in danger of developing a permanent underclass, a self-perpetuating culture of poverty, a substantial and continuing 'lumpen-proletariat' in the 'home of opportunity' where every man is the equal of every other man."

- Carnegie Council on Policy Studies
in Higher Education

PART 1: DIMENSIONS OF THE PROBLEM

President Jimmy Carter's speech of January 10, 1980, announcing his proposal for a new youth employment program in the 1980's is only one of the more recent in a long series of government pronouncements and programs addressing this critical issue. The need for a more successful approach to providing this education and job placement for an American "underclass" of teenagers has generated considerable news coverage as well as an abundance of professional literature.

How serious are the problems of youth unemployment and youth undereducation? What relationship exists between the problems? What kind of programs are needed to combat the problem? This chapter attempts to review the relevant literature in order to address these questions.

Youth Unemployment

How many teenagers are current members of an American underclass? As always, it depends on which statistics you care to believe. The Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that 13.9% of the 24 million 16 to 17 year olds in America were unemployed in 1979. However, a long term survey, the National Longitudinal Study, questioned youths themselves rather than heads of households and estimated the overall youth unemployment rate at 19.3%.

Youth Undereducation

Two indicators of undereducation have been measured. First, the dropout rate, which has stabilized since the mid 1960's: each year about 23% of high school students drop out prior to graduation. (Carnegie Council: 1979; Bibliographical Reference #6) A second indicator is the functional literacy level among teenagers. A recent study by the U.S. Office of Education asked 17 year olds to perform such tasks as following simple written instructions,

reading a bill or check or identifying the date for payment on a traffic ticket. The study concluded that nearly 10% of all 17 year olds are functionally illiterate. (Vice President's Task Force: 1980; #46) This may, however, be a conservative estimate. Another study found that "substantial numbers of high school graduates have deficiencies in language and numerical skills - estimated at 20 percent." (Carnegie Council: 1979; #6)

The 1975 Adult Performance Level study found that over 20% of 18 to 29 year olds, the group closest in age to teenagers, were unable to read want ads or a W-2 form, address an envelope, or calculate change at the store. The rate of functional illiteracy among the 19 to 29 year old group was higher than among 30 to 39 year olds, indicating a possible decline in basic skill attainment which could continue into the current generation of teenagers. (Copperman: 1978; #10)

Combining the problems of youth unemployment and undereducation, it might be suggested that "about one-third of our youth" are "ill-educated, ill-employed, ill-equipped to make their way in American society." (Carnegie Council: 1979; #6)

Subgroup Unemployment

Three groups are disproportionately represented in this underclass: youth from poor families, young women and minorities. As compared to a general youth unemployment rate of 13.9%, the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates the rate for poor youth at 19.3%, for young women at 14.4%, for blacks at 31.4% and for Hispanic youth at 16.4%. Here again the National Longitudinal Study gives higher figures, estimating black youth unemployment at 55.4%. The Urban League had in fact previously argued that the true black youth unemployment rate was closer to 60%.

For these groups, and in particular for minorities, the problem seems to be much more deeply rooted than for young white, middle class males. "There has been a decided upward trend in the unemployment rate for non-white teenagers since 1954, whereas the data reveal only a slightly upward trend in the unemployment rate of white teenagers and no appreciable upward trend in the ratio of the unemployment rate of white teenagers to the overall adult rate. Thus, the unemployment problems of nonwhite teenagers appear

to be structural in nature - much less closely related to fluctuations in the economy than those of white teenagers." (Carnegie Council: 1979; #6)

Among minority youth the structural unemployment of blacks seems most serious. "Twenty-five years ago the unemployment rate for white youth was about 13 percent; it remains about the same today. Twenty five years ago the unemployment rate for black youth was 16 percent; today it has grown to over 30 percent." (Vice President's Task Force: 1980; #46) "For blacks, half of the variable in teenage unemployment is unexplained. Every aspect of the experience will differ for the black - they will live where there are fewer jobs, their job finding network will be less effective, they are likely to have less experience. Only a small proportion of employers must practice outright discrimination to magnify these differentials." (Vice President's Task Force: 1980; #45)

The unemployment problem for women is a structural problem of a different kind. At age 17 more young women than young men are employed. But beginning with age 18 they begin to encounter more difficulty in finding a job and by age 24 have fallen significantly behind. By age 26 only 42% of all men are still working as low paid operators or unskilled laborers, while 80% of all employed women are at this lower end of the labor market. (Vice President's Task Force: 1980; #46)

Future Subgroup Unemployment

While the total number of all young people ages 16 to 21 will decline slightly during the 1980's, the number of youths in the three hard hit subgroups is not likely to decline (Vice President's Task Force: 1980; #46) In particular, future prospects for minorities are grim. During the last two years, minority youth unemployment grew about three times as fast as white youth unemployment. (Sawhill: 1979; #35) While only 7.5% of the white population is under 18 years old, 38% of blacks and 42% of Hispanics are under the age of 18. (Cardenas: 1979; #35) As this demographic trend continues in the 1980's youth unemployment will be even more concentrated among minorities.

Subgroup Undereducation

While the dropout rate is 23% for all youth, it is 35% for black youth and 45% for Hispanics. (Carnegie Council: 1979; #6) Within the Hispanic

subgroup the dropout rate varies, and is as high as 50% for Mexican Americans and 60% to 70% for Puerto Ricans. (Rueda: 1979; #35) While white youth thus have a much lower rate of non-completion, among low income families the rate for white youth is higher than for blacks and Hispanics. (Carnegie Council: 1979; #6) Youthful females are more likely to graduate than young males and actually have a higher employment rate than men at age 17. Under-education is clearly not the problem for this subgroup but rather, as indicated earlier, a result of inequities in the job market.

Reports across the country consistently indicate a pattern of lower achievement on a standardized tests within big city school systems, which tend to have a higher concentration of low income and minority youth. Studies have demonstrated this relationship between race and test scores, even when tests are controlled for cultural bias. (Jencks: 1972; #19) The reasons for this difference are controversial and need not be discussed here. The end result is a lower level of skill attainment among low income and minority youth. "As the already advantaged advance the less advantaged tend to fall farther behind." Carnegie Council: 1979; #6) The previously cited USOE study found that 40% of black 17 year olds were functionally illiterate, a rate four times higher than that for the general population of 17 year olds. (Vice President's Task Force: 1980; #46)

In conclusion, the problem of undereducation and unemployment is a critical one, affecting up to one-third of our nation's youth. The problem is particularly acute for females, the poor, and minorities and can be expected to endure and worsen during the next decade.

* * *

*"A fair day's wages for a fair day's work:
it is as just a demand as governed men ever
made of governing. It is the everlasting
right of man."*

- Thomas Carlyle

PART 2: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN UNEMPLOYMENT AND UNDEREDUCATION

For the American underclass, unemployment and undereducation suffered separately or in combination during their teenage years will forever retard their ability to enjoy "the everlasting right of man."

The National Longitudinal Study supplied strong evidence that "those who suffer extensive unemployment in youth are more likely to do so as adults, even when the data is controlled for sex, race, education, and similar factors." (Mangum and Walsh: 1978; #24) In addition, "work experience while in high school seems to be correlated with post employment earnings." (Cooper: 1979; #54) This effect on later employment and earnings may be due in part to "training used on the job and acquired outside formal schooling...the results point very clearly to the positive effects of... training upon the employment and earnings of youth by race and sex." (Adams and Mangum: 1978; #1)

Length of schooling can also be separated as a distinct factor affecting future employment prospects. "High school graduate youth suffer only one-half the unemployment of high school dropouts of the same age...the best insurance against unemployment is to stay in school." (Mangum and Walsh: 1978; #24) "Walther found that on virtually every measure of labor market performance available, youth who left school without obtaining their high school diplomas have poorer records than those who completed high school; i.e., unemployment rates are higher, labor force participation rates are lower, and they fall largely into the dual labor market syndrome of frequent movement among unsatisfactory jobs." (Mangum: 1978; #25) Even when other related factors are controlled, graduation makes a critical difference. (Hills, Shaw, and Sproat: 1980; #6) The job market for dropouts continues to shrink. In 1950, 34% of all jobs were available to young workers without a high school diploma. By 1970 only 8% of jobs in the economy were open to the 23% of American youth with low educational levels - 11 years of school or less. (Rodriguez: 1980; #45)

While teen unemployment and dropout rates can be measured as distinct factors affecting future employment, the relationship between the two becomes quite striking when the role of basic skills attainment is considered. On the one hand, a high school student who is deficient in basic skills is less likely to become employed. Many employers will not hire young workers from poverty areas, despite tax incentives offered by the government, because the youth lack basic skills. (Vice President's Task Force: 1980; #45) While this can be called excuse making by private industry, there is evidence suggesting a relationship between basic reading skills and job performance. A recent study found that it takes approximately a seventh grade

reading level to hold a job as a cook, and eighth grade level to hold a job as a mechanic, and a ninth or tenth grade level to hold a job as a supply clerk. (Sticht and McFann: 1975; #39) This same study, however, found that some persons with skills which were far below job demands were satisfactorily performing the work. Thus, some have suggested that the process of learning the job, reading the instructions, etc., may be the most critical entry barrier to jobs. (Schrack: 1979, #11; Rodriguez: 1980, #45) The actual process of getting the job, given the increasing bureaucratization of institutions, may also take a higher level of skills than actually doing the job. (Rodriguez: 1980; #45)

A basic skills deficiency not only causes difficulties for high school students seeking employment, but is likely to cause higher drop-out rates as well. Those prone to drop out are likely to score below average on ability tests, to have poor classroom grades, and to have been held back one or more grades in school. (Bachman, Green, and Wirtanen: 1971; #4) This relationship becomes more striking when one examines data regarding delinquents. Only 1% of juveniles arrested are convicted of serious crimes. (Vice President's Task Force: 1979; #52) This suggests that the majority of so-called juvenile delinquents are status offenders with social adjustment problems, such as truancy or uncontrollable behavior. Various studies have found that the major cause of juvenile delinquency was school failure, and was a more significant predictive factor than race or income. (Polk and Halferty: 1966, #38; and Jensen: 1976, #20) Another study found that as many as 85% of the youth who appear in juvenile court are disabled readers. (Kvaraceus: 1974; #22) Not too surprisingly, a student who falls behind the rest of the class in reading skills is more likely to become frustrated, resort to delinquent behavior and drop out of school.

To be sure, mastery of basic skills is somewhat dependent upon ability. However, studies by Bloom, and by Hause and Wachtel have indicated that many slow learners can learn as much as average or fast learners. (Rodriguez: 1980; #45) Slower learners who persist in school tend to have comparable rates of employment and earnings to fast learners with equal years of schooling. (Jencks: 1972; #19) As many as two of three dropouts are in fact intellectually capable of graduating. (Rodriguez: 1980; #45)

In conclusion, a youth's ability to secure employment as a teenager and graduate from high school both influence whether he or she will ever

escape the American underclass. However, both factors overlap and are highly dependent upon mastery of basic skills. Without such skills, a youth is less likely to obtain employment while in high school and is less likely to graduate. This would seem to suggest an integrated approach to both problems, rather than unilateral efforts at remedial education or job placement.

* * *

"Employment, training and education programs can work and probably are working better than gainsayers claim."

- Brian Lindner and Robert Taggart

"Rereading the literature concerning employment and training programs for youth is not an encouraging exercise. There has been much to tide youth over a difficult period of their lives but not much to change the basic difficulties underlying high unemployment among youth."

- Garth Mangum and John Walsh

PART 3: YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS: A GENERAL OVERVIEW

Whatever disagreement there may be about the effectiveness of youth employment and training programs, their seeming inevitability calls at least for a determination of what kinds of programs work best. Given the current and future undereducation and unemployment problem, employment and training problems are likely to endure; the only question concerns the design of these programs.

Numbers Served

In fiscal 1977, two million youth participated in CETA programs. (NASBE: 1979; #29) This represented a tremendous increase in program enrollment since 1963, when 24,000 youth were served. (Killingsworth and Killingsworth: 1978; #21) Moreover the steady, year by year increase in the numbers during Democratic and Republican administrations suggests a growing bipartisan commitment to such programs.

Overall Impact

Given the tremendous growth of employment and training programs, a substantial impact might be expected. Indeed, one study found that "almost 30% of the total decline in the overall national unemployment rate between 1964 and 1969 was a consequence of the statistical effects of employment and training programs; and that these statistical effects account for nearly all (90%) of the decrease in the teenage unemployment rate between 1964 and 1969." (Killingsworth and Killingsworth: 1978; #21) The same study found that employment and training programs lowered the overall unemployment rate by .8% and the teen unemployment rate by 3.9% in 1976.

The YEDPA program alone has accounted for one-fourth of all employment growth for teenagers and three-fourths of the growth for black teenagers since December 1977. (Vice President's Task Force: 1980; #46)

Do such short run statistical effects, however, have a long-term impact on future earnings and employment of youth in their later years? This question is of course more difficult to answer, as indicated by the contradictory quotations which began this section.

Income Transfer Versus Training

The only sure statement that can be made about youth employment and training programs is that in the short run a youth is given an income and joins the statistically employed. Past programs tend to have been dominated by "an analogue to Gresham's law that seems to be at work whereby concern about transfers of income almost always drive out the work aspect of a program to create jobs. This law was applicable to the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Operation Mainstream, and 11 of those good acronyms that we had during the sixties and seventies, and it certainly worked in the WPA and the PWA." (Weber: 1978; #47) Youth given such "jive jobs" become very street wise to the system, cities and program officials become dependent on the funding, and a constituency for largely ineffective programs is established.

Thus the pressure to spread resources broadly spends them badly. "The record is reasonably clear that mere participation in work experience programs, without program enrichment of various kinds, is ineffective in reducing school dropouts, encouraging youth to return to school, or in improving the employability of youth. It does provide income and take youth off the labor market. There is some evidence that crime rates were reduced

somewhat and the work experience certainly does the participants no harm." (Mangum and Walsh: 1978; #24) However it does not produce any long term results. According to the 1978 Employment and Training Report of the President, one reason for high youth unemployment is the failure of many employment and training programs to develop marketable job skills. (NASBE: 1979; #29)

"Less reliance on the income maintenance approach...would lead to improved programs." (Linder and Taggart: 1980; #45) The program strategies that "can be identified from the literature as having consistently contributed to successful adjustment to work and adulthood...include programs providing increased educational attainment, programs leading to increased labor market awareness...and programs aimed at facilitating the socialization of youth and developing their skills for coping with the demands and values of mainstream society." (Mangum: 1978; #25)

Thence comes potential disagreement. Few if any programs exemplifying such an approach can be considered unqualified successes. There is general agreement that income transfer programs are not the solution. The disagreement arises regarding specific approaches within program models that provide genuine training.

* * *

*"If you think education is expensive,
try ignorance."*

- Ann Landers

PART 4: YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAMS: SPECIFIC APPROACHES

The characteristics of programs which successfully meet the needs of high risk youth can be divided into five areas: (1) out-of-school youth; (2) in-school youth; (3) prime sponsor role; (4) linkages with the local education agency; and (5) private sector. Characteristics of program staff are briefly treated in Chapter Four, which presents eight case studies.

I. PROGRAMS FOR OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH

A Non-Traditional Educational Setting Must Be Provided

If there is any issue on which substantial agreement can be found, it is that out-of-school youth should not be returned to school settings where they failed, but should be given some form of alternative education. (Hoyt: 1978, #17; MDRC: 1979, #26; Youthwork: 1979, #55; Wurzburg and Colmen: 1979, #49; Vice President's Task Force: 1980, #45; National Council on Employment Policy: 1980, #48; Mangum: 1978, #25) As indicated earlier, the main reason youth drop out is to get away from school." (Rodriguez: 1980; #45) One study found that rates of police contact rise at an accelerating pace as long as delinquents are in school. When students drop out, however, the rate falls suddenly to half its previous level and continues downward. (Rodriguez: 1980; #45) Thus, returning a dropout to the setting of his or her failure is a detrimental policy doomed to failure.

Interviews with out-of-school students eligible for YETP programs indicates that even "the promise of a paycheck was an insufficient inducement for youth to return to school settings where they had failed before." (Youthwork National Policy Study: 1979; #55) Indeed, the Youth Entitlement program had similar results: only 9% of all enrollees were dropouts, due to a reluctance of dropouts to return to their schools in order to gain a job. (MDRC: 1979; #26) "Minor alterations in classroom settings" or transferring students to different but nonetheless traditional schools was not enough to overcome past negative experiences. (Youthwork National Policy Study: 1979; #55)

Some school officials have also been adverse to returning dropouts to their schools, with one principle complaining that "the very ones that had been kicked out used CETA as a way to get back into the system." (Wurzburg and Colmen: 1979; #49) Thus, both dropouts and school officials are reluctant to renew an unpleasant experience.

In contrast to this negative relationship is "research sponsored largely by the U.S. Department of Labor over the last 15 years" providing

"clear indications that some alternative approaches to education may produce more positive results." (Hoyt: 1978; #17) The reasons are many: "smaller classes" and "warm and personal attention" (Rodriguez: 1980; #45); the fact that students personally choose the school and thus feel a sense of commitment (Youthwork National Policy Study: 1979; #57); and the ability of such schools to better meet a student's individual need. (Youthwork National Policy Study: 1979; #57)

In many cases the alternative schools operate out of community based organizations; in some cases they operate as separate, radically changed units within the local education agency, modeled on CBO alternative schools.

Education is a Critical Need, and Specialized Attention May Be Needed for Students with Less than a Fifth Grade Reading Level

Even after enrollment in a special education program and placement in a job, some students may not succeed. Some students may need even more intensive help. Specifically, students lacking even a minimal mastery of basic skills may need special attention. "Program strategies must take into account the educational levels . . . of participants." (Mangum: 1978; #25)

The achievement level at which students need special placement cannot be pinpointed precisely, given different motivation and ability levels among students. A fifth grade reading level is generally considered the cut off point for functional literacy and may in fact be the most logical point at which to divide placement of students. It has been suggested that federal skill training programs of the sixties were unsuccessful training participants with less than a "fifth grade" reading level and that "nothing will make a job dead-end and dumb like the inability to read and comprehend directions." (Schrack: 1979; #51)

Once the more severely handicapped readers are identified, the appropriate program strategy may involve "low student-staff ratios, which was utilitarian in helping youths with educational problems" or the "flexibility of the alternative school approach" which "allowed greater latitude in the structure of teaching remedial education" for the "educationally handicapped." (Youthwork National Policy Study: 1979; #57) The key requirement for success is a willingness to face the

fact that remedial education is not cheap and inevitably requires a more individualized approach. The advantage of identifying the severe remedial readers is that this more expensive approach is used only with participants who need it.

Academics Are Closely Connected to Work Experience

Past experience has demonstrated that bare bones programs providing only a job will not be effective for most youth. (Pines and Morlock: 1977; #37) Another report indicated that the NYC program concept has minimal results at best. (GAO: 1973; #44) A follow-up study of 1,444 rural youth did not show measurable beneficial effects from participation in work experience programs. (Henry and Miles: 1974; #15) The deficiency common to all programs was a complete lack of coordination between work and school. Indeed, "work and education coordination is more than a conceptual theme - it is a practical necessity." (Linder and Taggart: 1980; #45)

Teaching career awareness and job preparation skills to participants is the first step in connecting the school and work experiences. Many studies have indicated that most high school students have unrealistic aspirations and expectations concerning work. (Singell: 1966; Reynolds: 1951; Ornstein: 1975; all cited in #2) A study of two thousand college graduates found that three-fifths of the students had little awareness of the job market when they selected their major. (Parnes: 1976; #36)

Here again there is considerable agreement on the need to include career awareness and job preparation instruction within any youth employment programs. (Mangum and Walsh: 1978, #24; NASBE: 1979, #29; White House Task Force: 1980; #45) However, such instruction by itself is not necessarily effective; it must be part of a coordinated program with work experience and more intensive services (Youthwork: 1978, #56; Vice President's Task Force: 1980, #45)

This is the second part of connecting academic and work experience. Classroom instruction in career awareness skills, etc. must be linked to work experience, to assure that the classroom experience is relevant to

the world of work and that the work experience builds on skills learned in the classroom. Communication between the classroom instructor and the job site supervisor must therefore occur. At nationwide conferences youth participants were critical of programs in which the curriculum "did not reflect actual job opportunities" and stressed the need for "more connection between what goes on in school and on the job." (Center for Public Service: 1979; #53) One study concluded that 50 work education programs failed because they did not emphasize the importance of matching work and learning. (Frankel: 1976; #55) "Sites should be encouraged to form a specific link between the education and work experiences of their enrollees." (Youthwork National Policy Study: 1979; #55) The more specific and systematic the connection, the more likely that classroom and work experiences can be adjusted to achieve a proper fit. One possible approach is to "assure the continued support of a work experience coordinator who will serve as counselor, mentor, and technical advisor "because it is an essential component of an effective program." (Gess: 1978; #13)

The third step in connecting academics and work experience involves using the job or work experience as leverage to improve a student's school attendance. At this point, it has been amply documented that work experience has little impact for students who fail to graduate or are deficient in basic skills. The logical approach is to use the natural financial incentive of the work experience to improve a student's attendance. Even given the low numbers of dropouts enrolled in Entitlement programs, and their reluctance to return to traditional schools, it was still found that 83% of the dropouts who returned to school did so because of the opportunity to get a job. (MDRC: 1979; #26) In YETP programs it was found that the "requirement that youth attend school before being allowed to work "has had the desired effect of increasing school attendance." (Youthwork National Policy Study: 1979; #55) This type of approach can be used to improve job attendance as well. In alternative schools, "if participants missed or were late to their job, a system of docking them pay and credit came into effect. This strategy increased job and class attendance." (Youthwork National Policy Study: 1979; #57)

Worksites Are Monitored Regularly

In order to assure that work experience programs are not just "an excuse for income transfer and a source of activity to keep kids off the street," an assurance is needed that meaningful work is being performed under adequate supervision. (Mangum: 1978; #25) Indeed, "close supervision of enrollees in work placements and extensive and individualized contact between enrollees and staff are crucial ingredients in successful projects." (Youthwork National Policy Study: 1979; #55) Thus the need for monitoring worksites. Many cities are "adopting aggressive monitoring programs (or requiring program delivers to do so). In Kitsap County, "worksites are visited every two to six weeks." (Wurzburg: 1980; #50) The "successful programs each have staff who provide direction and feedback throughout the student's affiliation with the program. When this direction is not provided, youth and adults have noted negative consequences (e.g., youth begin to get bored with the job, youth do not experience satisfaction in training, job-site supervisors express a desire for more direction)." (Youthwork National Policy Study: 1979; #57)

Work Experience Stresses Employment Readiness Training Rather Than Specific Skill Training

The fact that the labor market is changing has received extensive documentation. Over two-thirds of jobs are now service sector jobs and the minority of jobs in the manufacturing sector continue to decline in proportion to the total job market. The Labor Department estimates that of 66.4 million new jobs created between 1978 and 1990, 49 million will be white collar and service jobs and 16.2 million will be blue collar jobs. Professional and managerial positions now account for one out of every four jobs, and more and more jobs demand "conceptual skills, like the ability to use symbols and abstractions." (Vice President's Task Force: 1980; #46)

In short, fewer welders and more educated workers are needed. "An examination of job content" generally suggests that a standard high school

education without any specific pre-entry skill training is sufficient preparation for two-thirds of all current jobs. (Mangum and Walsh: 1978; #24). For the other one-third of jobs remaining, the formal pre-entry training required is very often a post-secondary education.

Effective work experience programs have been found to concentrate on "general intellectual and manipulative skills much more than specific occupational skills." (National Bureau of Economic Research: 1979, #53; Mangum and Walsh: 1978; #24; Osterman: 1979; #54) Some, however, have misunderstood this approach to mean a process of instilling the work ethic into an ungrateful younger generation of workers. In fact, two surveys found a higher degree of allegiance to the Protestant work ethic among the 18-25 year old group than among any group of older people. (Andrisani: 1978, #3; Vice President's Task Force: 1980, #45) The learning process involved in work experience will inevitably help to instill the work ethic; but efforts to emphasize only this element of the work experience are misguided. Rather, a broad definition of work experience should be operative, including "all employability strategies that prepare people for work." (Pines and Marlock: 1977; #37) Constructive work experience giving youth a legitimate chance to acquire intellectual and manipulative skills useful on a variety of jobs should be the ultimate goal.

Supportive Services Are Necessary

Dropouts and educationally disadvantaged students have extraordinary needs; training programs of the last 15 years have found that supportive services are critical to program success for such participants. (Mangum: 1978, #25; Edelman: 1979, #54; Linder and Taggart: 1980; #45) Unfortunately, efforts to provide these services are often judged by standards developed for low overhead income transfer programs. Thus, while many prime sponsors administering YCCIP saw the need to provide supportive services for these participants, they were financially unable to provide it. (Wurzburg: 1980; #50)

One critical supportive service is counseling. "Counseling is a useful adjunct to employability development and placement if it helps the youth come to a better self understanding, recognize the type of conduct expected by employers and the need to develop a reputation for stability and diligence, improve school and job performance, and understand and participate more effectively in the labor market. Unstructured, sensitivity type sessions and non-employment oriented personal counseling have no measurable impact upon employability or work performance." (Mangum: 1978; #25)

One other effective activity for counselors is to advocate for youth in trouble. (Mangum: 1978; #25) The link between school failure and juvenile delinquency has already been shown. The potential universe of need for counselors is huge; in 1978 there were nearly 4 million juvenile arrests. (Vice President's Task Force: 1980; #46)

Good counselors, however, cannot operate effectively if serving huge humbers. Counselors in the Manpower Development Training Act Skills Center served primarily as disciplinarians. "They check attendance records, intervene in conflicts between trainees and teachers, and in crises, arrange for supportive services. The ratio of one counselor to 181 trainees suggests that little else may have been humanly possible." (Mangum and Walsh: 1973; #24)

Day care for teen mothers is another critical supportive service. As many as half of all economically disadvantaged black women have a pregnancy before their 20th birthday. (Furstenberg: 1979; #54) A large proportion of illegitimate births are to young people who are unemployed, have relatively little education and come from low income families. (Chilman: 1976; #7) In 1977, there were 570,000 mothers under the age of twenty. Adolescent mothers inevitably have a much harder time graduating from high school and finding stable employment. (Furstenburg: 1979, #54; Card and Wise: 1978, #5)

Yet, "young women with children are largely ignored by public employment and training programs until their children reach the age of three." (Linder and Taggart: 1978; #45) This unquestionably makes for less effective programs. "No employment program will have a great success unless it is coordinated with day care services." (Furstenberg: 1979; #54)

II. PROGRAMS FOR IN-SCHOOL YOUTH

Academic Instruction Is Provided by the Local Education Agency

While experience indicates that dropouts must be served by alternative schools, in-school programs are clearly the province of the local education agency (LEA). "The CETA system should not compete with mainstream training institutions for students, but should reinforce and complement those efforts when mutually agreeable. The CETA system should provide training to under- or unemployed out-of-school youths." (National Council on Employment and Policy: 1980; #48) In this way educational resources which are scarce in proportion to the youth undereducation problem are best used.

Moreover, experience indicates that the in-school projects have achieved the most cooperation and support from the educational system. (Youthwork National Policy Study: 1979; #57)

Academics Are Closely Connected to Work Experience

This concept has been discussed with respect to out-of-school youth; the same approach is needed within in-school programs: (1) career awareness/job preparation skills must be provided; (2) communication between the on-site supervisor and academic staff must be facilitated; and (3) work experience should be used as leverage to improve school attendance.

Unfortunately, "crude estimates indicate that school-based programs are typically diverting the bulk of their resources to enrollee stipends and wages, contributing little to the institutional changes necessary to make employability development a more integral part of the education process." (National Council on Employment Policy: 1980; #48) There is not enough being done to assure connection of work experience and academics within in-school programs.

Much of the responsibility for making a connection between work experience and the classroom falls on the teacher. "Whether or not work experiences are related to educational experiences will, in reality, depend on the degree to which the teaching faculty recognizes the need and possibilities for doing so . . . it is in the classroom . . . where

the student will either experience, or fail to experience, relationships between school subjects and work experience opportunities." (Hoyt: 1977; #18)

There is evidence that jobs can be successfully used as leverage in improving attendance of in-school students. In the Entitlement program there was a small impact on the school retention rates of in-school youth and school administrators felt that Entitlement's most notable impact was on "marginal" youths on the verge of dropping out. (MDRC: 1979; #26)

Work Sites Are Monitored Regularly and

Work Experience Stresses Employment Readiness
Rather Than Specific Skill Training and

Counseling is a Necessary Supportive Service

(See Out-of-School section for a discussion of the above approaches.)

III. PRIME SPONSOR ROLE

Every Attempt to Centralize Programs Should Be Made

Even on the federal level, department lines of authority and funding for employment and training overlap. Once the differing jurisdictions of state and local governments, 473 prime sponsors, and school boards which often operate independently of the local government are added to the picture, one might understandably conclude that centralization is impossible and cooperation exceedingly unlikely. Certainly the school systems have not achieved such a concept. One evaluator found "there were no instances in which school systems had orchestrated their full spectrum of federal education resources in order to target on students needing employment services It appeared that the concept of combining

funds from several other federal authorities and building a program that, in toto, addressed the problem of youth employment in a comprehensive way, had not been developed . . . at the state or local level." (Wurzburg and Colmen: 1979; #49)

While the full orchestration of such a concept has not occurred, there is ample recognition of the need to start humming the tune. Increased collaboration and shared decision-making among local schools, manpower agencies and community based organizations has been widely recommended. (Youthwork National Policy Study: 1978, #56; NASBE: 1979, #29) The perils of duplication are suggested in the comment of one prime sponsor representative. "I talked to one employer back in 1974 and he said, 'What the hell is this? The government must have a lot of money to throw around.' People from other programs had already talked to him about employing students." (Youthwork National Policy Study: 1978; #56)

While school systems may not have achieved such a concept, prime sponsors are in a better position to achieve such centralization.

Centralized Intake/Assessment Is Run by the Prime Sponsor

Prime sponsors appear to be in the best position to centralize and provide intake and assessment. "A fundamental question . . . is which type of organization (LEA, CETA, NPO, etc.) best serves disadvantaged youth along which dimensions. Programs administered by prime sponsors, as a group, were more successful in reaching proposed enrollment figures in the first six months than were those youth-initiated projects administered by LEAs. . . . CETA sponsored projects became operational sooner, enrolled youth more rapidly, allocated monies more quickly, and followed their proposed plan more closely than did LEA sponsored projects." (Youthwork National Policy Study: 1979; #57) Centralizing intake and assessment would also help to end duplication of effort.

Prime Sponsor Determines and Monitors Goals

Armed with information obtained from the assessment process, the prime sponsor would be in a unique position to establish overall local

goals for subcontracting agencies, monitor their performance and base re-funding of programs upon adherence to these goals. One analysis of the prime sponsor experience recommended that the Department of Labor encourage prime sponsors to "assess their own programs" and "develop a system for rewarding self evaluation and, more importantly, rewarding program quality." (Wurzburg: 1980; #50)

In particular, the need for prime sponsors to monitor the performance of the LEA has been identified. Where prime sponsors abdicated authority over the YETP 22% set aside funds, "the resulting school programs frequently have been conducted without regard to the overall YETP program objectives or other CETA youth programs." (Wurzburg and Colmen: 1979; #49)

There appears to have been an increase from 1978 to 1979 in the attention that prime sponsors are paying to program results, particularly with respect to monitoring of work sites and site supervisors, indicating a movement toward this concept. (National Council on Employment Policy: 1980; #48)

IV. LINKAGES WITH THE LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCY

The difficulty of establishing linkages with the LEA has received ample documentation. "Unfortunately the public schools, by and large, have not shown much predisposition to participate in youth employment and training despite more than 15 years of co-existence with local programs." (Wurzburg and Colmen: 1979; #49)

Several valid causes for this phenomenon have been advanced: (1) the uncertain, seemingly ever-changing funding levels and regulations of CETA; (2) the mismatch in fiscal years between CETA prime sponsors and school systems; (3) the different networks of accountability, each agency generally being responsible to different local authorities, while the LEA is additionally answerable to the state and the prime sponsor is a creation of the federal government; and (4) LEA unhappiness with the income targeting provisions of CETA, which exclude some students considered to be just as needy. (Wurzburg and Colmen: 1979; #49) As a result, cooperation between the two entities has been chancy.

The intention of YEDPA, the federal government's CETA venture of 1977, was to increase CETA/LEA collaboration with the provision setting aside 22% of monies for the LEA. And indeed, "virtually all prime sponsors succeeded in signing agreements with the local schools. But many of the

initial agreements were not thought through in the crisis climate of implementation and reflected more the aspirations of some enlightened individuals (and the rhetoric of the Department of Labor) than feasible prospects for action. The hasty, mid-semester start of the first year programs did not provide adequate opportunity for them to be properly implemented. The prevalent pattern for the second year of programs in the 1978-79 school year was to simply continue the first year designs." (Wurzburg and Colmen: 1979; #49)

Other analysis has confirmed the uneven results of the 22% set aside provision. At 11 project sites it was not seen as having stimulated collaboration, while at 19 other locations, collaboration was promoted. (Youthwork National Policy Study: 1978; #56)

Specific Staff are Assigned This Function

Where collaboration has occurred, specific staff member(s) was/were often designated as specialist(s). A "liaison person to shuttle between the local project and representatives of both the CETA and educational systems... appears to have had considerable impact at nine sites in terms of providing an established communication channel, steering paperwork to the correct person or committee, and serving as a buffer between bureaucratic demands and the day-to-day functioning of the program." (Youthwork National Policy Study: 1978; #56)

Process Followed by Staff to Establish Linkage

There is no substitute for personal relationships in establishing a situation of trust between CETA and LEA representatives. Indeed, "sustained relationships seem to be a prerequisite for changing LEA's for which short term funding and forceful rhetoric are poor substitutes." (Wurzburg and Colmen: 1979; #49) "A school administrator noted that strengthening of the relationship, in general, has occurred because members of one system are on the committees of the other system." (Youthwork National Policy Study: 1978; #56) Establishing these kinds of relationships should be the goal of any staff member assigned to establish linkages with the LEA.

Attempts should also be made to become knowledgeable regarding all LEA resources relevant to potential youth programs. One "key" resource is a "mediator," an LEA official who attempts "to resolve issues arising from contract monitoring...and ambiguities surrounding CETA eligibility...The mediators occupy a variety of positions, including director of occupational

education for a school district,...director of youth programs,...principal of a school." (Youthwork National Policy Study: 1978; #56) The more involved in program implementation this mediator becomes, the more this LEA official will become an advocate for the program.

Eventually, efforts must be made to establish relationships at various levels of the school system bureaucracy. Six youth programs successful in arranging academic credit for work experience "had the support at all levels of the school system bureaucracy whereas, the remaining projects, which were experiencing problems, only had the support of one or two levels of the school system. If only one sector of the school bureaucracy, e.g., guidance counselors, was committed to the program...then the project had difficulty." (Youthwork National Policy Study: 1978; #56)

A final potential approach for staff involved in establishing a linkage with the LEA is to barter funds. In 1978 and 1979, two-thirds of prime sponsors allocated more than 22% of funds to CETA/LEA agreements, and of these prime sponsors, half allocated 50% or more to the LEA. (Wurzburg: 1980; #50) This obviously indicates that prime sponsors are taking a flexible approach in working out a CETA/LEA package. Whether this generous allocation to the LEA is any sign of successful linkage is questionable, however. Previous evidence has indicated uneven success getting collaboration with the LEA. Certainly, money alone is not the answer. "Cases of healthy CETA-LEA partnerships as well as cases in which there are chronic ill feelings between CETA, prime sponsors and local educators bear out the conclusion that financial incentives alone are not sufficient..." (Wurzburg and Colmen: 1979; #49) But for CETA staff who have used other methods to establish linkages with the LEA, juggling of the 22% monies and other funds which may now or could potentially pay for LEA programs, is an additional approach worth considering.

V. PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT

The desirability of establishing linkages with the private sector need hardly be explained. Employment programs interested in positive results for high risk youth need only ponder the fact that 80% of all jobs are found in the private sector. (Vice President's Task Force: 1980; #46) Experience, however, indicates a profound reluctance on the part of the private sector to become involved in employment and training programs. In

the Entitlement program, even with 100% wage subsidies, private employers were reluctant to hire participants; as a result less than 50% of placements were in the private sector. (MDRC: 1979; #12) Vocational exploration programs of the YETP program, in which youth are placed in work settings to observe (and thus are paid subsidized wages) had a similar experience: only one of ten programs was able to locate enough work placement sites for participants. (Youthwork National Policy Study: 1979; #55)

Department of Labor spokesmen have speculated that private sector reluctance to participate is due to employers' negative feelings about poor youth. (Nation's Schools Report: 1980; #31) There is also some evidence that employers fear the prospect of opening their books to potential governmental inspection. (Youthwork National Policy Study: 1979; #57)

Whatever the reason, there are strong feelings of resistance in the private sector which will obviously take a concerted effort to overcome.

Efforts Made to Solicit Cooperation

In those instances where private sector cooperation was secured, two approaches stand out. One involved establishing a committee of private industry representatives, an approach which has now been federally formalized with the formation of private industry councils (PICs). Evaluation of this approach suggests "that schools which have developed productive linkages with the businesses and industries of their communities are better able to mount successful youth employment programs." (Wurzburg and Colmen: 1979; #49)

The other approach involves starting at the bottom. One Vocational Exploration program had all 130 of its youth participants canvas the neighborhood in small groups. After three months over 700 businesses had expressed an interest in the program, yielding far more potential work sites than could be used. (Youthwork National Policy Study: 1979; #57)

Small Businesses are Used as Work Sites

If the intention of employment and training programs is to prepare youth for the actual labor market, efforts to place youth into small businesses may be most appropriate. Between 1969 and 1976 66% of new private sector jobs were created in businesses with less than 21 employees and 11% of new

jobs were created in businesses with 21 to 50 employees. The largest 1,000 businesses generated less than 75,000 new jobs during a period in which the total labor force increased by 14 million. (Burch: 1979; #35) This feeble performance of large businesses becomes more interesting if one considers that this sector employs one quarter of the current total labor force. (Vice President's Task Force: 1980; #46)

There is also reason to believe small businesses may be more cooperative with employment and training programs. Historically large manufacturing firms have been unresponsive, prompting the labor department to begin an effort to woo smaller businesses. (Green: 1979; #54) One program official found "that placement of 17 year olds with the bike shops of the world and the TV repair and small manufacturers--quasi apprenticeship kinds of things where...the relationship can be individualized, where the young person can relate to somebody, where a relationship of trust can develop...works very nicely." (Edelman: 1979; #54)

Given the generally negative experience of employment and training programs attempting to promote linkages with large businesses, an approach aimed at smaller businesses may well deserve further examination.

CHAPTER THREE
CONSOLIDATED FINDINGS

-37-

In this chapter, the characteristics of eight exemplary programs are reviewed. Conclusions are based heavily on the observations of various program officials from Prime Sponsors, LEA's, CBO's, etc., in the eight cities visited. The emphasis is on what approaches work and more particularly on which of these approaches are common to some or all of the youth programs. The findings are divided into five areas: (1) programs for out-of-school youth; (2) programs for in-school youth; (3) Prime Sponsor; (4) linkage with the LEA; and (5) private sector.

I. PROGRAMS FOR OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH

A. A non-traditional education must be provided.

In Baltimore a program official observed that even the jointly (LEA and Prime) administered alternative schools carry the handicap that the facilities "look like" public schools. In Boston, the Entitlement Program had great difficulty recruiting out-of-school youth to return to public schools, even with the carrot of a paycheck. In none of the eight cities visited was any success reported returning drop-outs to traditional schools.

In response to this a variety of imaginative solutions have been devised including the following:

1. CBO alternative schools receiving CETA money from the prime to serve drop-outs. (Baltimore, Boston, St. Paul, San Francisco).
2. CBO alternative school receiving funding directly from the federal government (Philadelphia).
3. CBO alternative schools which receive funding from the LEA (St. Paul, Minneapolis).
4. GED instruction in a community college (Baltimore, Berkeley).
5. Computerized instruction in a facility run by the prime sponsor (Baltimore).
6. An alternative school in a modified LEA setting, jointly run by the LEA and prime (Baltimore, Boston).
7. An alternative school in a modified LEA setting, jointly run by the city and LEA (Seattle).
8. An alternative school established by the LEA (Berkeley, Seattle).
9. Evening or late afternoon classes in an adult high school or vocational school (Baltimore, Berkeley).

These approaches give out-of-school students a second chance in a different setting, where instruction tends to be more individualized and informal, and oriented toward basic skills remediation.

B. Greater per participant CETA costs may be required.

As opposed to in-school programs, in which instruction is provided in public schools supported by public education dollars, out-of-school programs may involve higher CETA costs because the education is paid for by CETA. Nonetheless, youth programs have made this investment because out-of-school students are those most likely to lack basic skills and to be unemployed and because these students will not return to traditional schools. Alternative education actually tends to be much cheaper than public education; in Boston CBO's receive \$1,375 per student to provide education and supportive services, while in Minneapolis an alternative school provides education and work experience (but not wages) at \$21,000 for 12 students. This is a much lower figure than for the local public school counterpart. However, the entire amount is underwritten with CETA dollars, resulting in higher CETA costs than for most LEA in-school programs.

An exception to this pattern is found in St. Paul and Minneapolis, where the LEA has contracted for many years with CBO alternative schools. In these cities, the alternative school often uses public education dollars to provide instruction and CETA dollars for supportive services.

C. Programs feature a half day of academics and a half day of work.

For drop-outs who have been out of school for some time and have negative expectations about school, a full day of school may not be a realistic expectation. Moreover, it may not be a necessity. In Baltimore out-of-school students receiving a half day of instruction average as high as a two grade level increase per six months instruction in reading and math.

The following cities feature out-of-school programs with a half day of school and a half day of work: Baltimore, Boston, Minneapolis, St. Paul and Seattle. Two variations on this pattern include San Francisco, where out-of-school students receive a half day of instruction but no work experience at a CBO, and Baltimore, where students in the LEA/prime alternative school alternate one week of

instruction with one week of work experience, thus averaging one half day of each.

In the Philadelphia OIC program out-of-school students received instruction for a full day, but the program was time limited, with a definite goal in sight, and depended heavily on community and parental involvement with the program.

- D. Remedial education is a critical need, and specialized attention may be needed for students with less than a fifth grade reading level.

To offer a work program for out-of-school students which does not provide remedial instruction can probably be expected to have a minimal long term impact on youth unemployment, given the documented basic skill problems of drop-outs. All eight cities visited provided academics as well as work experience for out-of-school students.

In Seattle, some out-of-school students were placed in an on-the-job training program at a local CBO, but even here substantial training occurred, and this option was strictly for older students.

Academic instruction for drop-outs tends to require a lower ratio of staff to student. In Boston the ratio was 1:15 or less, in Minneapolis 1:10 or less, and in Philadelphia 1:13 or less.

In particular, a lower staff/student ratio is required for severely disabled readers. This may require a separation of out-of-school students, with some students (below 5th grade reading level) given more intensive services. In Baltimore students with less than a fifth grade reading level are placed in special classes with a 1:5 ratio. Boston has found that students at this level need extra attention and sometimes doubles academic staff for this population. Philadelphia found that students with less than a fifth grade reading level could not cope with their program, and needed more intensive service.

If students with less than a fifth grade reading level are given separate, more intensive services, it may not be necessary to maintain a 1:10 or 1:15 staff/student ratio for other out-of-school students. There is not enough experience with this concept to make any absolute conclusion.

Moreover, there is nothing absolute about the fifth grade cut-off. The concept of providing more intensive services for the most disabled readers is the key finding, and the definition of this level may vary somewhat depending upon student motivation, local program specifics, etc.

E. Academics are closely connected to work experience.

1. Career awareness/job preparation skills are provided, usually as classroom instruction.

The following cities provide this service for out-of-school students: Baltimore, Berkeley, Boston, Philadelphia, Seattle, and St. Paul. In Boston and Baltimore the prime sponsor provides a ten hour and three week session respectively, in these skills. In Philadelphia and St. Paul a trimester or more of such instruction occurs in the classroom. In Berkeley a State Employment Service staff member provides a week of 90 minute sessions in these skills, reinforced and broadened thereafter with lunch time and Saturday classes. In Seattle, attempts are made to teach these skills during the counseling sessions and six hours of such instruction are given in an orientation session.

Some of the commonly included skills include practicing job interviews, job application completion training, grooming and dress, telephone etiquette, occupational information, field trips and guest speakers for career information, etc.

2. Communication between on-site supervisor and academic staff occurs regularly.

Such communication was particularly emphasized in the following cities: Baltimore, Berkeley, Minneapolis, Philadelphia, and Seattle. In Minneapolis a youth coordinator working out of an alternative school was responsible to coordinate the education and work experience for twelve students. In Philadelphia, weekly meetings of academic staff and hands-on supervisors occurs. In Seattle counselors with a case load of 35 students meet each month to discuss their clients with the academic staff and job developers. In Berkeley students sit down with an Employment

Counselor or Academic Counselor twice a month and receive "side by side" counseling from both counselors twice a semester. In Baltimore students in the LEA/Prime alternative school alternated two weeks of academics with two weeks of work experience, with each experience influencing and reinforcing the other. Other students were given Experience Based Career Education, which flexibly combined work experience and academics. For example, a student in a health field would write English compositions related to his/her work on the job.

In Boston a prime sponsor official expressed dissatisfaction with communication between caseworkers and academic staff. This was seen as an important aspect of the program, however, and one which will receive more attention in the future.

3. Jobs are used as leverage to improve school attendance.

The following cities use this approach: Baltimore, Berkeley, Boston, Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Seattle. In Baltimore 80% attendance is required on the job and in school. In Berkeley a "C" average and regular attendance is required of participants. In Boston warnings are issued to students with less than 75% work or school attendance and after two warnings students are dropped from the work program. In Seattle youth begin on six months probation and are required to meet 80% attendance requirements in school and on the job. Seattle also uses a warning system.

F. Worksites are monitored regularly.

The following cities emphasized regular monitoring of worksites: Baltimore, Berkeley, Boston, Minneapolis, Philadelphia, St. Paul, and Seattle. Monitoring ranged from as often as every week (Philadelphia) to every six weeks (Seattle). Most programs attempted to visit work sites for monitoring purposes every two to four weeks. In Minneapolis program officials stressed the need for variable monitoring. Some youth are more successful and some worksites

have a proven record of reliability so that there is less need for monitoring, while other sites may require frequent visits.

G. Work Experience is not intended as specific skill training but as general employment readiness training.

In all eight cities visited, work experience was oriented toward general employment readiness training rather than specific vocational training in welding, etc. In Baltimore, Berkeley, and Seattle a small percentage of students were given specific skill training.

H. Supportive services are critical to success.

1. Counseling -- All eight cities visited stressed counseling in out-of-school programs. The ratio of staff to youth varied from 1:12 in Minneapolis to as high as 1:90 in Baltimore. The majority of programs had a ratio of staff to youth of 1:20 to 1:50. Baltimore was the only city exceeding this range but there the ratio was as low as 1:35, depending on the particular program. The ratio was lower for students with the most severe basic skills deficiencies in Baltimore. The need for such counseling was widely recognized and the predominate emphasis was on one-to-one counseling in which academic and work performance was discussed, and general discussion of personal problems, etc., was minimized.
2. Day Care -- In Baltimore day care is seen as a critical need because 35% of participants are parents. Up to 50% of participants are parents in Boston but program officials estimated care as the critical factor for 5% of participants. There was wide agreement on the need for day care but few programs have had the financial resources to establish such a service. Baltimore, Boston and Seattle do provide free day care while counselors in several other cities attempt to locate day care for clients.
3. Transportation -- All cities but San Francisco provided transportation money for participants. The most common procedure was to provide transportation until the participant received the first paycheck.

II. IN-SCHOOL PROGRAMS

A. Academic instruction is provided by the LEA, resulting in lower per participant CETA costs.

In all seven of the cities with in-school programs, the instruction was provided by the local education agency. Thus CETA funds were only used for wages, supportive services and other non-academic program features. As a general rule this assured a lower per participant CETA cost although the overall per participant cost was undoubtedly higher, even given less provision of supportive services in the in-school programs as opposed to out-of-school programs.

The in-school programs tend to be considerably larger, reflecting the fact that: (1) out-of-school programs are of more recent vintage; and (2) the relative ease with which regular students can be served, as opposed to drop-outs. In-school programs were often extensions or modifications of NYC programs started in the 1960's.

B. Academics are closely connected to work experience.

1. Career awareness/job preparation skills are provided, usually as classroom instruction.

All seven sites with in-school programs provided this service, ranging in intensity from San Francisco where issues were discussed as needed by counselors, to St. Paul, where a daily career awareness class was offered. In most cities, the service offered was similar to that offered in the out-of-school program, and covered the same skills. In Minneapolis, the students were given their paychecks immediately after the monthly career workshop, which ensured a high rate of attendance.

2. Communication between on-site supervisor and academic staff occurs regularly.

In all seven in-school programs this occurred, with a "teacher coordinator," an "educational liaison" or "caseworker," etc., operating as a liaison between work supervisors and academic staff. Here again the service offered was similar to that described under the out-of-school program. In St. Paul the "career teacher" works with 50 students, providing counseling, teaching the career awareness course, and modifying the course content based on job site

visits. This was one of the more systematic linkages between work and academics.

3. Jobs are used as leverage to improve attendance.

Here again this feature of the program is similar to that described under in-school programs. All seven in-school programs have a 75% or 80% attendance requirement and many programs require, in addition, that students must be passing anywhere from one to all of their courses each semester. In St. Paul this approach is used on a daily basis: if a student misses school on a given day the career teacher calls the work site to inform the supervisor that the student is not allowed to work that day.

As opposed to out-of-school programs with their mix of half day work/half day school, in-school programs generally required a full day of school with work experience occurring after school.

C. Worksites are monitored regularly.

Here again, all seven in-school programs used this approach, and most programs attempted to visit work sites every two to four weeks.

D. Work experience is not intended as specific skill training but as general employment readiness training.

As in out-of-school programs, all in-school programs visited emphasized this approach, with a few exceptions for a small percentage of students.

E. Counseling is a critical supportive service.

All seven in-school programs provided counseling for participants. Counselors were often responsible for linkage between work and school, monitoring attendance, etc. in addition to providing counseling relating to work and school adjustment. In Berkeley, St. Paul, and Seattle, a counselor/student ratio of 1:50 was maintained. Other programs had a higher ratio than this which inevitably results in less counseling for participants and in less communication between work sites and school.

III. PRIME SPONSOR

A. Every attempt to centralize is made.

Employment and training programs may involve CBO's, LEA's, the prime sponsor, the private sector, etc., which will inevitably result in duplication of functions and conflicts in goals. In all eight programs visited, attempts have been made to combine these forces, with varying degrees of success. Generally the prime sponsor takes on this task. However, in St. Paul the LEA has created a Center for Youth Employment and Training (CYET), which takes on this role with the blessing of the prime sponsor. CYET has developed and oversees all work sites in St. Paul, may transfer students from in-school to out-of-school programs, etc. Other examples of possible methods of centralization will be discussed below.

B. Centralized intake/assessment run by the Prime Sponsor.

The general pattern here is that prime sponsors do intake and/or assessment for out-of-school programs while the LEA does intake/assessment for the in-school program. The exception is St. Paul, where the CYET does intake for in-school and out-of-school programs and because of this centralization keeps administrative costs to a minimum. Most programs have attempted to centralize intake in order to reduce this administrative cost.

In Baltimore, Berkeley, San Francisco, and Seattle achievement tests (reading, math, etc.) are given by the prime sponsor to all out-of-school youth. This information helps the prime sponsor in placing youth into the proper program.

Thus in Baltimore, youths with less than a fifth grade reading level, youths with a 5th to 8th grade reading level, and students with a reading level above 8th grade all are placed into different programs. In San Francisco and Baltimore post-testing is also done, thus providing a standard method of measuring the success of academic instruction within out-of-school programs.

A second kind of assessment performed is a vocational or career interest inventory, a standardized or locally developed instrument to measure the career interests, skills and knowledge of incoming participants.

The prime sponsors in Baltimore, Berkeley, Boston, and Seattle perform this assessment for all out-of-school youth. This information can also guide the prime sponsor in placement of youth into the proper program. No such post-testing has been attempted, although Baltimore is considering such a procedure as a method of measuring vocational learning by out-of-school students.

A third type of assessment is a check of medical needs. Only the Baltimore prime sponsor does such an assessment on all out-of-school youth. The results are quite significant. Twenty percent of incoming participants have untreated vision problems and four percent have undiagnosed hearing problems. Eventually Baltimore hopes to perform a complete physical examination on all out-of-school youth. In Seattle and San Francisco a systematic medical check of all out-of-school youth does not occur, but medical and dental care is provided for any youth identified as in need of service by counselors.

The more sophisticated and consistent the assessment process the more likely the prime sponsor can assure placement of students into the proper program and provision of all needed services.

C. Prime sponsor determines goals.

Generally the prime sponsor releases "Request for Proposal" (RFP) instructions to local agencies and reviews subsequent proposals. As such the prime sponsor is in an ideal position to determine overall goals for youth programs. This position is strengthened as intake/assessment information is received and evaluated.

1. Prime sponsor determines proportion of in-school and out-of-school youth to be served.

In Seattle the two-county prime sponsor allocates funding to the city and the school system through a fair share formula based on census and dropout data for the target area. Thus, an exact goal for in-school and out-of-school population to be served is determined. In Boston prime sponsor officials pressured MDRC to expand their capability of serving out-of-school youth within the Entitlement program, based on locally observed needs.

2. Prime sponsor sets performance goals for subcontracting agencies.

The most sophisticated example of this concept exists in Baltimore. Here the prime sponsor negotiates performance based on contracts with all out-of-school programs, including programs run by the LEA. Programs are expected to: (1) retain 80% of participants; (2) achieve an average per participant grade level in reading and math achievement of anywhere from one grade per year to two grades per six months; (3) require and accomplish an average of 80% attendance for participants; (4) positively place 50% of graduates (in college, full time jobs, etc.); (5) monitor work sites at least once a month; (6) provide monthly reports by on-site supervisors.

In Boston some general goals have been set for CBO alternative schools regarding number of participants to be served, program hours, curriculum, etc.

In Minneapolis, the prime sponsor sets goals for CBO's providing education and supportive services, including services to be provided, staff/participant ratio, etc.

In San Francisco the changeover to a uniform pre and post test of achievement has only recently occurred. The test results will enable the prime sponsor to measure the success of subcontracting agencies and set goals in this area.

D. Prime sponsor monitors goals.

Prime sponsors already fund subcontracting agencies based on a competitive proposal process. Monitoring of programs to determine if proposal goals are met and to provide information regarding upgrading and expansion of goals is less widespread and less thorough. Nonetheless, there is a perceivable movement toward this concept, and toward a system of funding subcontractors based on strong performance standards.

In Baltimore program monitors are considered the "linchpin" in the system, and receive considerable training. A prime sponsor official suggested that the LEA out-of-school program was expected

to meet performance standards or the program would be transferred to some other agency, such as a CBO, that had a better performance rating. Several programs have been dropped and others expanded over the years based on these performance standards. The employment service or job service in Baltimore was transferred from the city to CBO's because of a superior performance by the CBO's.

In Boston weekly visits by prime staff have been made to CBO's to check attendance of students and program compliance. Two programs have been dropped for poor performance while a new program was recently added. In Philadelphia a prime sponsor official felt a strong need to "get into the business of education," that is, improve their ability to monitor education programs. Some programs in Philadelphia have been defunded, based solely on program monitor recommendations and despite local political pressures. In St. Paul the LEA youth program administrator and the prime sponsor youth director dropped one subcontracting agency because of poor performance and are considering another such action. In San Francisco program monitors have become a critical part of an expanding youth program staff, and competitive contracts are renewed on a yearly basis after a careful review of performance. A uniform system of pre/post tests will increase the ability of the San Francisco prime sponsor to measure performance.

IV. LINKAGES WITH THE LEA

A. Specific staff are assigned this function.

Given the inherent unreliability of CETA funding and the differences in goals and systems of authority for CETA prime sponsors and local education agencies, linkages between the two systems will only occur with sustained effort. LEA officials need to know there is a prime staff member that can be counted on regularly, and the prime sponsor staff member needs time to become an "education expert." In six of the eight cities visited, member(s) of the prime sponsor took on this task. In the Philadelphia OIC program the OIC staff devoted considerable time to this function. In Seattle the city government, rather than the prime sponsor, had specific

staff working on this linkage. Various approaches to this linkage were used by staff "education experts;" these will be explored below.

B. Processes followed by staff to establish linkages.

In some cities the establishment of a personal relationship between prime sponsor and LEA staff was critical in forging a linkage. This relationship broke down barriers and gave both institutions a sense of united purpose. In Boston, St. Paul, and Seattle the prime sponsor youth program administrator and an LEA administrative official established a good working relationship founded on personal trust.

A second factor in establishing linkages with the LEA is a process of getting to know the LEA and the location of valuable resources within the system. In Minneapolis, St. Paul, San Francisco, and Seattle a former NYC administrator with an efficient track record was an obvious resource to use in establishing and continuing CETA in-school programs. In Boston "educational liaisons" who previously learned the ins and outs of the school system through involvement with desegregation were able to locate key actors and resources within the LEA which helped establish both in-school and out-of-school programs.

A third factor in forging linkages is a process of establishing relationships with principals, counselors, etc., at the portion of the school district to be included in a youth program. This strategy was effective in Baltimore, Boston, Berkeley, Philadelphia, San Francisco and Seattle. In Baltimore, Boston, and Berkeley, staff from the prime sponsor and schools jointly run an out-of-school program, while the Seattle city government and LEA run such a joint program.

A final approach in establishing linkages with the LEA is a process of bartering funds. Thus, in Minneapolis the prime sponsor pays 25% of the education costs for special education students, which receives a 75% match under Minnesota state law, thereby expanding the CETA program. In San Francisco the 22% YETP set-aside money is actually allocated out of CETA IIB funds, giving the LEA only one title to deal with and thereby streamlining operations.

In Philadelphia the prime sponsor used the carrot of YETP funds to convince the LEA to combine all youth programs under one office, thereby cutting administrative costs.

V. PRIVATE SECTOR

A. Efforts made to solicit cooperation

The reluctance of private industry to cooperate with employment and training programs has been well documented and in the eight programs visited there tended to be minimal success in this arena. Any success that occurred was due to sustained efforts by prime sponsor staff to solicit cooperation, at the upper end with private industry councils and/or at the lower end, with visits to shops, businesses, etc.

In Baltimore one prime sponsor staff member is assigned the task of working with the private sector and the emphasis has been on the upper end, with advisory committees of employees organized by cluster area of employment. The council provides information on opportunities in their cluster, what skills are required, etc. Once private job placement began, council members visited programs to advise the prime sponsor regarding training.

In Philadelphia the OIC program put together a strong industrial advisory board and staff members also worked to cultivate relationships with neighborhood employers. Noteworthy cooperation has been received from the private sector.

In Boston 20% of work experience placements are in the private sector. On the upper end the PIC has not been notably active, but on the lower end individual businesses have been willing to increase youth wages by 5% based on set performance criteria for youth workers. Since the youth wages are 100% subsidized through the Entitlement programs, this raise in some youth wages is indicative of a real private industry commitment to the program.

In Seattle, a prime sponsor staff member has been designated as job developer, and has been soliciting private cooperation at the lower end by contacting neighborhood businesses.

B. Small businesses are used as worksites.

Job sites at small agencies can often mean more personal attention for youth workers. In St. Paul, no private sector placement occurs, but the majority of the non-profit job placements are at small programs because youth have received more personal attention in such settings.

In Baltimore some large manufacturers were initially used for work experience, but the experience was not positive. Now almost all private sector slots are at small businesses with less than 21 employees. In Seattle the limited success with private industry placement which occurred was in smaller businesses in the light manufacturing sector.

The Boston "YES" program, however, had a slightly different experience. There, work experience placements were most successful with either small businesses or large (over 50 employees) businesses. The middle range businesses (21-50 employees) were least cooperative and provided the poorest supervision of youth.

It is difficult to make a definitive judgement regarding private sector placements, given the general lack of success for employment and training programs attempting to involve the private sector.

CHAPTER FOUR
EIGHT CASE STUDIES

BALTIMORE

Introduction

Baltimore has a population of 800,000. The estimated unemployment rates are 9% overall, 35% for youth and 57% for minority youth. The mayor, elected in 1971, has been strongly supportive of youth programs. Since the mayor appoints the school board and the City of Baltimore is the Prime Sponsor, the mayor has considerable control over both the Prime and the LEA. Given the high youth unemployment rate and dropout rates (8,000 high school students drop out of Baltimore public schools each year), the problems are considerable. Baltimore has a yearly budget of over \$35 million for youth programs including Tier I Entitlement, SYEP, YETP, Baltimore Public Schools, and YCCIP funds, in descending order of importance. One thousand eight hundred students are served in out-of-school programs and 5,000 students are served in in-school programs. The Entitlement serves a portion of the city and considerable effort has been made to recruit all youth in that area.

Considerable evidence of the success of the program exists. Out-of-school program participants have averaged 1.3 grade level increases per year, a figure which is expected to increase. Sixty percent of graduates were positively placed. Eighty percent of youth enrolled in work programs received ratings of good or better from employers. There is a 40% attrition rate for out-of-school participants, but the highest percentage leave in the early stages of the program (intake, assessment, etc.). Thus, 80% retention rates are required of and met by alternative schools.

Out-of-School Programs

Out-of-school programs provide academic instruction in: (a) four CBO alternative schools; (b) a computerized instruction program of basic skills based in the YWCA facility using PLATO terminals; (c) a special alternative career education program located in the public schools run jointly by the LEA and the prime; (d) GED programs run by the LEA; (e) extended day vocational programs located in four vocational high schools offering after-school instruction; (f) a GED program run by a local community college. Program officials observed that students must not be returned to traditional school settings, and that even special LEA programs

located in non-school public buildings carry the handicap that the facilities "look like" schools.

Option (d) features alternating two week cycles of academic instruction and work experience in three clusters, including community health, institutional health, and business. Two other clusters offer Experienced Based Career Education, with a more flexible combination of work experience and academic instruction in a variety of occupational areas. Option (f) also gives participants a chance to continue their education after passing the GED, with community college courses.

All these programs average about a half-day work/half-day school, except (e) the extended day vocational program, in which participants work full time. Program officials believe, however, that this has tended to be a burden for the participants.

Participants entering with less than a fifth grade level are placed in options (a) or (b), with staff/student ratios of 1:5 or less. Baltimore has experienced the highest attrition for this group.

In every component academic staff are informed regarding student progress on the job. Job sites are visited every two weeks. Eighty percent attendance is required of students.

All participants receive youth effectiveness training prior to job placement. This is a three week concentrated course in career awareness/job preparation skills.

All job placements are intended to provide work experience, not specific skill training (except a small training program for participants above a seventh grade reading level).

All participants receive counseling (1:35-90 ratio of staff to participants, depending on the program; there's a lower rate for those below a fifth grade reading level).

Thirty five percent of the participants are parents. Free day care is provided for participants who agree to take parent effectiveness training. There is a waiting list for day care, however.

Transportation is offered for participants until they begin earning wages.

In-School Programs

In-school programs are all located in LEA public schools and, consequently, have a much lower per participant CETA cost.

The YIEPP in-school programs serve 5,000 participants. Students work after school and also receive career awareness training after school. An educational liaison employed by the prime counsels students, visits work sites, monitors student class attendance and grades, and communicates with academic staff. The ratio of liaisons to students is 150:1, which, while rather high, is reflective of the size of this program component.

Six hundred eighty students are served in a vocational careers program located at several public vocational high schools. Students work after school in the same area they are studying, supervised by their school vocational instructor.

Sixty students are served in the new Pre-Apprenticeship Training Program providing after school, skilled training in plumbing and sheet metal repair. A data processing training component may be added.

The YIEPP in-school program provides general work experience, while the other two programs are rare examples of skilled training.

All students in all components must maintain 80% attendance and passing grades in order to stay in the work program.

Prime Sponsor

The prime sponsor runs a Youth Enrollment Center, to which all youth are referred for intake. Youth are tested for reading/math/language grade levels and vocational interests and knowledge. The Maryland Society for Prevention of Blindness provides free vision tests. Twenty percent of participants have untreated vision problems. Hearing tests are also given by a hired audiologist. Four percent of participants have hearing problems. Resources are being sought to provide follow-up medical care as well as a complete physical examination since medical problems are seen as a cause of participant failure.

Youth then go to a central assessment center run by the prime sponsor, where they receive three weeks of youth effectiveness training.

Performance based contracts for out-of-school programs are negotiated with the LEA as well as CBO's. Tough academic achievement gains are expected (as

high as one grade level per 6 months for 80% of CBO alternative school participants). Eighty percent attendance is required for all participants and all programs are expected to positively place 50% of graduates (in jobs, college, etc.). The LEA out-of-school program must meet a goal of one grade level gain per year per participant. No such standards are required for in-school programs.

Prime sponsor staff monitor performance and have dropped several programs over the years for poor performance and have expanded others for good performance. One notable example is employment service (job service), which is now performed only by CBO's, due to poor performance by the city office.

Linkages with the LEA

LEA cooperation seems assured because the mayor appoints the school board and vigorously supports youth employment programs. The superintendent and prime sponsor director regularly meet to discuss the program.

The Harbor City out-of-school program is run jointly by the LEA and prime. Prime sponsor staff indicated that it took four years to really get the program "humming", and that even today there are problems with the teachers union.

Private Sector

After the riots of the 1960's, the private sector was motivated to begin meeting with the schools and expressed their concern about the skills of graduates. Businesses underwrote a career awareness program at the schools and co-sponsored a project to give teachers a background in economic education. This history and the mayoral leadership were factors in getting the private sector involved. Also, they have been allowed to "cream" youth placed in private sector job sites. (Twenty percent of sites are in the private sector - about 360 sites; YIEPP funds are used.) Initially, some large manufacturers were used, but this experience was not positive. Now almost all private sector slots are at small businesses with less than 21 employees.

Staff

In seven years the prime sponsor grew from a staff of 40 to a staff of 800, of which 60% are youth staff. The staff is 75% minority and 25% white. Program monitors were described as the "linchpin" in the system, and require considerable training. Prime sponsor staff need not be hired through the city's

civil service system, another special feature of Baltimore resulting from strong mayoral leadership. On-site supervisors are never paid. Union teachers in the work program voluntarily work longer hours each day.

BERKELEY

Introduction

The City of Berkeley has a population of 113,000, with 50% white, 30% black, 10% Asian, and 7% Spanish speaking. The CETA program is 80% black, 10% Spanish speaking, and 10% white. The largest employer is the University of California, the second largest is the City of Berkeley and the third largest is the Public Schools. One high school serves the whole city and it is located centrally.

Out-of-School Program

Berkeley is a Tier II Entitlement Program with a \$2.5 million youth budget. It has served 1,070 kids 16 years old and older since March, 1978, and there are currently 475 on board. Eighty to ninety kids are dropouts who have returned to school. Students are required to attend school for the full day and maintain a "C" average. If students are doing well in school they may work up to 20 hours per week. If students fall below a "C" average they are put on probation and are required to take tutoring four times weekly. Seventy-five percent of participants are reading between a 4th and 8th grade reading level.

Intake is done at the Entitlement Center by a State Employment Service staff member who is contracted half-time for all certification. A week long series of 90 minute orientation sessions give an introduction to the program and the world of work. Assessment includes a 2½ hour Reading Assessment, 1 hour Career Assessment, and 4 hour Career Workshops. Reading and Career Assessments are done by the Career Specialists at the school. Side by side counseling is an essential component of the program. Six Academic Advisors supervised by the school and six Employment Counselors supervised by the city each have a caseload of 50 students. The Academic Counselor is responsible for monitoring academic performance and achievement as well as doing personal counseling. Each Academic Counselor is trained in counseling or social welfare. The Employment Counselors

are responsible for placement, assistance in planning Career Education, supervision of the youth at the worksite, and processing and collecting time cards. Twice a semester the student meets with both of his/her counselors jointly. Otherwise they meet with students twice a month.

Of the dropouts who are brought into the program, most attend the Adult High School or the Peralta Community College for their GED. Originally Peralta was solely responsible for recruiting and preparing kids for the GED. Staff was not used to deal with this population and, as a result, more involvement by the counselors was necessary.

Occupational training is available through the East Bay Skills Center in the following areas: Clerical, Cashier, Electronic Assembly, Cable TV, Industrial Maintenance, Cooking, and Account Clerk. Students can attend two afternoons per week after school for three hours and be paid for time attended. The program offers hands on experience, with students being treated like employees. A similar 2 year program is offered on a 7 hour per day, 5 day a week basis after students graduate from high school. The six hour a week program provides the opportunity to explore the program and assure success upon entry into the regular program. Problems with the program center around students being required to attend a full day of class until 2:30 and take the bus to the Skills Center for class from 3:30 - 6:30. This has not gone over well with the students. A solution to be implemented next semester will allow students to receive academic credit for course work at the Skills Center and be released from class during part of the regular school day.

In-School

Focus is placed on 14 to 15 year olds for the in-school program. YETP funds are used to provide work experience at non-profit sites. It is an NYC type program with few, if any, supportive services. Fourteen to 15 year olds were not included in Entitlement because it was felt they could not handle the requirements of that program.

Prime Sponsor/LEA

An important factor in understanding the success of the program in Berkeley is the close working relationship between the City and the LEA. This can be

partially accounted for by the fact that the present mayor was the head of the City Youth Employment Program before becoming mayor. The close working relationship is also grounded on a financial level, whereby all funds need to be signed off jointly by both the school and the City. The LEA becomes an equal partner in all negotiations of contracts and new proposals.

Staff at the Entitlement Project are $\frac{1}{2}$ employed by the City and $\frac{1}{2}$ by the LEA. Joint staff meetings are held weekly to discuss overall program and individual client performance.

Private Sector

The political climate with business isn't ideal due to some skepticism about the program. The program subsidizes private employers 100% for six months with the hope that the employer will pick up the student upon graduation. Placement in private sector is limited to seniors who will be graduating.

BOSTON "YES" PROGRAM

Introduction

The City of Boston, which is the local prime sponsor, has a population of 640,000. Finance, wholesale and retail trade, and service industries are predominant in Boston. The estimated unemployment rate is 4.2% overall, 11.5% for minorities, 9.4% for youth and 17.2% for minority youth. Boston has a strong school board which is locally elected and has had an uneasy relationship with the mayor. The "YES" program is a Tier I Entitlement program with a budget of \$23 million available for FY '79. The program serves 2,000 out-of-school and 8,000 in-school youth.

Out-of-School Programs

Out-of-school youth represent 25% of program participants. The program initially had trouble recruiting out-of-school youth because they didn't want to return to traditional schools. Alternative education settings were thus established, including: (a) an In-School Intensive Program which was created at the urging of the prime sponsor and is really a special alternative program for out-of-school youth located in 3 public schools and (b) 12 CEO alternative schools with 17 site locations. The CEO's provide all education and supportive services at a very low per participant cost of \$1,375.

These programs average about a half-day work/half-day school.

Although separation of students by grade level is not systematic, Boston has found that students with less than a fifth grade level need extra attention, and have sometimes doubled academic staff for such students. Staff/student ratios for out-of-school classes range from 1:5 to 1:15. In some cases, poor readers are removed from class and given individual tutoring.

A new component is being established to pay students wages to attend a 10 hour orientation to the world of work prior to job placement. Thereafter, minimal career awareness services are provided as needed. A Voc Ed counselor at each LEA alternative school visits work sites and adjusts a student's classes based on perceived career needs. Caseworkers employed by the prime are each responsible for 25 participants. They visit worksites at least every two weeks and attempt to communicate with academic staff at schools to coordinate work with academics. Warnings are issued to students for poor school (less than 75%) or work attendance or performance and after two warnings students are dropped from the work program. One "hearing coordinator" works for the prime sponsor hearing appeals of students dropped from the program. Having one hearing official assures uniformity in the appeal process.

All work experience is intended to teach general employment skills, not specific trade skills.

Counseling is provided to all participants. (1:25-45 ratio of staff to students). Day care services are provided. Although up to 50% of participants are parents, program officials estimate that day care is the critical factor for 5% of participants. Transportation from school to work is provided for all participants.

Program officials noted that location of programs at multi-purpose CBO's tends to allow for provision of supportive services by on-going CBO programs.

In-School Programs

Seventy-five percent of participants are in-school program enrollees.

Academic instruction is provided in public schools supported by public education funds.

A Liaisons, or staff members hired by prime sponsors and located at eight public high schools, handle recruitment, intake, monitoring of attendance and academic performance, soliciting academic support from schools, making curriculum adjustments, and facilitating transition from school to the world of work. Each liaison has a 100-450 client load.

Caseworkers operating out of the prime sponsor monitor worksites on a bi-weekly basis and communicate with liaisons and school teachers. Here again the caseworker/student ratio is 1:25.

All students will soon be paid wages to attend 10 hours orientation to the world of work prior to job placement. Minimal career awareness services are currently provided as needed.

Participants must maintain 75% attendance, a "C" average, and regular work attendance in order to stay in the work program. Here again, a two warning system is used.

Work experience provides general employment preparation, not specific skill training.

Prime Sponsor

The prime sponsor runs 5 assessment centers which process participants and give them a vocational interest inventory. All information is then given to educational liaisons at schools. The prime also runs the ten hour pre-work orientation session. Key actors within the prime sponsor had a background and interest in education and were immediately concerned about this issue in establishing the "YES" program.

CBO alternative schools were accepted after a competitive RFP process. The prime sets some general goals (i.e., 90% of participants specified in proposal must be enrolled at any time) and approves program hours, curriculum, etc. Weekly visits to CBO's are made to check attendance of students and program compliance.

Beginning in Spring, 1979, the prime sponsor made an unprecedented move and dropped two programs for poor performance. Officials noted that another program may be dropped soon, and that a new program was recently taken on.

Linkages with the LEA

LEA cooperation occurred because of: (a) the size of the YIEPP grant available; (b) pressure created by desegregation to deal with the youth problem; (c) the personal relationship established between an LEA official and a prime official; and (d) the system of educational liaisons placing a prime staff member at each receiving school. Prime sponsor officials stressed that such liaisons must be people from outside the LEA who nonetheless know the system intimately; that is, they know where resources are located and have gotten to know many of the key school actors.

The State of Massachusetts passed strong legislation extending services to the handicapped and youth with special needs, and another law allowing G.E.D. instruction to be counted for credits toward regular high school diplomas. This legislation also influenced a movement to provide services for dropouts and high risk youth.

A sign of the cooperation achieved with the LEA is an education task force made up of representatives from the prime, the LEA, the PIC, and the dominant local CBO. This task force recently received funding as a joint youth venture.

The Private Sector

Local businesses have not played a big role in "YES". There is a PIC council but it hasn't been notably active. Twenty percent of job placements are in the private sectors divided evenly between large (over 50 employees) and small (under 20 employees). Boston has found either type of placement workable, more so than placements in middle range (21-50 employees) businesses. All private sector job placements are YIEPP subsidized. About 5% of students get wage increases based on performance which private businesses provide.

Staff

The prime sponsor has about 350 youth staff. Tight program monitoring of CBO's occurs. Thirty-seven percent of prime staff are minorities and more than 50% are female. On-site supervisors are never paid. Teaching staff in the LEA In-School Intensive program are public school teachers who have expressed an interest in a special program and might thereby be expected to have positive feelings about the program.

MINNEAPOLIS

Introduction

The Prime Sponsor is the City of Minneapolis with a population of 359,578 and a minority population of 11%. Local basic industries include 3M, Honeywell, General Foods, Weyerhaeuser and a range of University and Governmental service positions. The city and school system have had a long history of cooperation and both have had experience with job programs for the last 10-15 years. The concentration of poor people is in the central city and is serviced primarily by four high schools.

The eligible youth population is 50% black, 39% white, and 10% Indian. The enrollment in the in-school program is over 500 while out-of-school services are available to about 150.

Out-of-School

The Prime Sponsor's Youth Employment and Training Program is responsible for contracting for all out-of-school youth programs. Alternative schools which were already in existence in Minneapolis provide most of the services. Students enrolled in alternative schools get a diploma through the Minneapolis Public School System. Students remain on the roster of their home school and as many as 25 % of alternative school students return to the home school by graduation. The public school system is able to count student dropouts who enroll in alternative schools for state aid purposes. The lead teacher at the alternative schools needs to be certified and is often paid one-half by the public schools and one-half by other funding through the alternative schools.

Programs at the alternative schools are usually one-half day of school and one-half day of work, using the job as leverage for attendance. There is also a heavy stress placed on counseling and worksite supervision. Classroom instruction has a special emphasis on basic skills and a low ratio of teacher to students (1:10).

The Prime Sponsor has a contract with each alternative school to provide education and work experience for 12 students under a contract which provides \$21,000 for a Youth Coordinator and Administrator. The Youth Coordinator is responsible for the 12 students at the school: monitoring caseload, worksite

supervision, payroll, certification and paperwork. Funding for a full-time counselor and supportive services are seen as essential for effective implementation of the program.

Three community organizations are also contracted with for counseling and supportive services for 12 students each and a contractual fee of \$13,000 for the 12 students. The education is provided by another institution. The CBO is responsible for the overall supervision of the worksite and coordination of education and work.

In-School

The Minneapolis Public Schools Youth Program has been in operation since 1965 when it was first funded under NYC. It currently serves over 500 in-school youth in a program which offers career education, counseling, and work experience. Students are enrolled in school for a regular five-hour day and can work up to 10 hours per week after school in a variety of non-profit organizations. If students miss more than five days per tri-semester or fail three of five courses, they are out of the program.

Six coordinators (1:100) are assigned geographically and are responsible for placements, counseling, attendance, academic achievement and payroll. Students are required to attend bi-weekly career awareness workshops for which they are paid. The two hour career workshops offer exposure to a different occupational cluster each month and checks are passed out at the end of the session insuring a high percent of attendance. Funds for the program are from CETA IIb, IV, YCCIP, Gov.%, and a \$40,000 cash grant from the LEA. In addition, CETA money is matched with formula grants to obtain more services; for example, special education teachers can be purchased for 25% with state aids paying 75%. As a result teachers can be obtained for the program with no direct cost to the LEA.

Special Basic Skills Instruction is offered through the regular Title I program in the schools. In addition, Job Service pays for staff to be at each of the six high schools one day per week to offer counseling and placement services.

Staff

Staff for the out-of-school programs are hired by the alternative schools individually. While most teachers may not be credentialed, they have experience working with hard-to-reach youth. The Coordinator at each school is responsible to the Prime Sponsor's monitoring unit. The low 1:12 ratio of Coordinator to student is one reason for the success of the out-of-school program, and the cost seems well worth it from the point of view of the Prime Sponsor staff.

The in-school program consists of one Director, six Teacher Coordinators, two School Counselors, five Clerical, and two Accountants. Teacher Coordinators work year round and are paid on an annualized teacher's salary. Fourteen teachers are also employed to conduct the Career Workshops at each of seven schools. Staff turnover has been very low. The Director has been around for 15 years, and Teacher Coordinators haven't changed for two years. Teachers have had three or four years teaching experience and generally have worked with low income students previously.

Part-time staff are paid on union scale as are full-time employees. But many extra hours are put in without compensation.

Prime/LEA

Youth programs have been operated by the LEA since 1965. The Prime simply provides the financial resources for the LEA to run its program. The Prime attempted to force the LEA to monitor and subcontract with CBO's. That became unworkable so now the Prime subcontracts itself. Strong leadership at the LEA has been responsible for an effective in-school program, while prime sponsor relationships with CBO's have made the out-of-school program most effective through a separate relationship with the prime.

Staff at the LEA are members of the union and are paid on the schedule of teachers and counselors; for a full-time program, this demands \$25,000 - \$30,000 salaries for year-round programs. CBO's and alternative schools operate on each organization's own personnel policies. Teachers need not be certified, nor are they paid on union scale.

PHILADELPHIA OIC CAREER INTERN PROGRAM

Introduction

The City of Philadelphia is the prime sponsor and has a population of 1,800,000. Local basic industries include health, garment, railroad, electrical, metal fabrication and wallpaper/textile industries. The estimated unemployment rate is 6.9% overall, 16% for minorities, 18% for youth and 30.5% for minority youth. The mayor appoints the school board, giving him considerable control over the LEA as well as the prime, but the previous mayor, Frank Rizzo, was not particularly committed to the youth employment problem. The election of a new mayor may influence the city's future direction on youth issues.

The OIC Career Intern Program is essentially an out-of-school program, although participants include potential dropouts identified by the LEA and referred to the OIC program. The program received funding until 1976 from the National Institute of Education, then received YEDPA funding and recently has relied on reduced funding from the Philadelphia Board of Education. The program has a maximum capacity of 250 enrollees, and this relatively small size is seen as one of the keys to its success. The program begins to enroll students in 10th grade; this year has been seen as the time at which students commonly drop out. As a community based agency, OIC has developed strong neighborhood and family ties, a factor which has definitely influenced success.

Out-of-School Program

Dropouts, youth identified as potential dropouts, and youth dissatisfied with public school education are served in the Career Intern Program (CIP). During the March, 1975-February, 1976 year (a year of program operation studied by the National Institute of Education), 40% of enrollees were out-of-school youth, 25% rarely attended school and were failing, 25% had "C" averages in school and 10% had "B" averages or better. The program establishment occurred because OIC staff found that dropouts and potential dropouts failed to succeed in a traditional environment. Philadelphia Prime Sponsor staff concurred with this observation: dropouts have not been willing to return to local public schools, and are not able to succeed in this traditional environment.

The program requires greater per participant costs than that spent on regular or Voc Ed students in the Philadelphia public schools.

Participants attend for 32 hours a week and may graduate in anywhere from 22 weeks to 3 years. Academic instruction infused with career education is continuous, culminating in three brief hands-on experiences in private sector employment. Participants are called "interns" rather than students and classes are ungraded.

Enrollees with less than a fifth grade reading level (in practice a 4.5 grade level tended to be the standard) are found to need more intensive instruction. Thus they are either referred to another program, or, in some cases, given more individualized help than other enrollees.

Curriculum is flexible, involving individualized learning packets, affective education, newspapers in the classroom, etc. Instruction is particularly geared toward career awareness and employment preparation, yet covers the state requirements regarding core curriculum. The teacher/student ratio is generally about 1:15 or less. Eighty-five percent attendance is required of participants.

Once hands-on experience commences, weekly meetings with on-site supervisors occur. Enrollees are not paid wages at any point in the program.

Work experience is intended as employment preparation, rather than specific skill training.

Counseling is described as a "critical" factor and is provided with a 1:20 ratio of staff to students. Day care is also considered important, and while not provided, is dealt with by counselors who attempt to locate such services. In New York City, the OIC program (one of four programs replicating Philadelphia's CIP) has found that 50% of female enrollees need day care services. Transportation is provided for all enrollees and is considered "crucial."

Counselors work hard to solicit family support of the participant. Given the voluntary nature of the program, this has been found to be a key to success.

Prime Sponsor

The prime has no relationship to this program since OIC received direct federal funding for it. However, talks with the Philadelphia prime sponsor revealed that program officials felt a strong need to "get into the business of education", that is, improve their ability to monitor education programs they funded. Some programs funded by the prime have already been defunded, based solely on program monitor recommendations and despite local political pressures.

The OIC CIP program achieved a retention rate of 65%, compared to 15% retention rate for the control group. In general, centralization of program services and monitoring of goals was easily facilitated since one facility and one program was operated. The average grade level increase in achievement was 5 months for every eight months of instruction. This was far above the control group, which averaged almost no achievement gain, but less than what might be hoped for.

Linkages with the LEA

CIP achieved an excellent relationship with the LEA. The school superintendent as well as the District 6 Superintendent (the target area for the program) strongly supported the program. Twenty-two elementary, middle, and senior high schools cooperated with the program. The high schools helped identify dropouts for the program. All schools participated in an OIC led effort to infuse career education in public school classrooms for grades K-12. Public school teachers attended Saturday in-service sessions (for pay) at OIC in which OIC instructors taught career education concepts.

Success coordinating with the LEA was due to: (1) the reputation of Rev. Leon Sullivan, D.D., the national OIC director (OIC national headquarters is located in Philadelphia); (2) OIC staff selling the program to the superintendent, district superintendent, the union, and all 22 school principals; (3) OIC use of certified or certifiable teachers (but not union members) as educational staff; and (4) the fact that at the time of program inception, the Philadelphia teachers union was not as strong as it is now.

Replication of the CIP program has been undertaken in Bushwick, the predominantly black section of Brooklyn, in Poughkeepsie, New York, Seattle and Detroit. In three cities there has been more LEA opposition from the school administration, while one city had more problems with the teachers union. In Seattle the OIC has begun to meet with public school teachers every three months in order to solicit cooperation. In Brooklyn students are recruited from three area high schools to attend OIC and receive a diploma from the public schools upon graduation from OIC.

Private Sector

Business support has been encouraging, and all sizes and types of businesses were used for hands-on experience. OIC has a strong industrial advisory board and inspired leadership from Dr. Sullivan in this arena.

Staff

In the Philadelphia CIP as well as all four replication models, the majority of staff are minorities, as is the population served. Hands-on site supervisors are not paid.

ST. PAUL

Introduction

St. Paul, the smaller of the Twin Cities, has a population of 295,000. Technological, food processing, milling and mining industries are particularly dominant in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. The city's estimated unemployment rate is 4.6% overall, 8% for minorities, 10% for youth, and 15% for minority youth. Nineteen percent of public school students are minorities. The city is the prime sponsor and the school board is elected. Prime sponsor staff described St. Paul as a city with manageable social problems, a relaxed lifestyle, liberal and supportive political leaders and minimal turf problems.

The yearly CETA youth budget is \$2,370,480, with about 40% of it budgeted for summer youth programs. Funding sources for school year programs include Title IIB, YETP and YCCIP in descending order of importance. The out-of-school programs serve 161 students, while in-school programs serve 330 students.

Out-of-School Programs

Out-of-school programs serve 161 students in CBO alternative schools or special alternative schools set up by the LEA, often in recently disbanded schools. Every CBO alternative school but one is now funded with public education dollars. Twenty-five percent of out-of-school students were out of school for 6 months or more.

Since both out-of-school and in-school programs receive public education funds, there is little difference in per participant CETA costs.

Out-of-school programs tend to feature half-day work/half-day school arrangements, except one evening high school.

All out-of-school classes have a teacher-student ratio of under 1:13. The degree to which students with less than a fifth grade reading level are served is unclear.

A vocational education counselor (1:80 ratio) monitors student progress. In addition, staff/student ratios in out-of-school programs are small enough to allow time for incidental counseling by regular staff. All students must take a class in career awareness skills. Some schools pay students wages for this. Work sites are monitored every 3-4 weeks. At least one school does not have attendance requirements, but schools requiring attendance may drop students from the work program for poor attendance.

Work experience provides general employment preparation, not specific skill training.

Counseling is given all students and bus tokens are provided for transportation. Attempts to use existing city day care facilities are made.

As of 1979, 125 students had graduated from the out-of-school component. Seventy-seven percent of students were positively placed after graduation, but only eight percent went into post secondary education.

In-School Programs

In-school programs serve about 330 students. Students attend regular public school classes all day, with the exception of a career awareness class taught in the morning by a special career teacher.

This career teacher is responsible for about 50 students, monitoring their attendance and grades, visiting work sites every 2-4 weeks, individually counseling students, making home visits when needed, placing students in jobs, and refining the career awareness class based on student work experience. Indicative of this commitment to monitoring work sites is that the career teacher's normal day includes two hours visiting the sites. The advantage of this approach is that counselors get to know students in a variety of situations: in school, on the job, in one-to-one counseling sessions, etc. If a student does not attend school on a given day, the counselor calls the work site to inform the supervisor that the student is not allowed to work that day. St. Paul's in-school program has a long history of documented success: students in these programs tend to have lower dropout rates than regular high school students locally. Eighty-nine percent of in-school enrollees are recommended for future employment by on-site supervisors and 70% of the 106 graduates in 1979 had gone on to a post-secondary school or training program.

Prime Sponsor

In St. Paul, the Center for Youth Employment and Training (CYET), an out-growth of the NYC program which has been run out of the LEA since the 1960's, is the central administrator for youth programs. Because the CYET and prime sponsor staff have an excellent relationship and because the CYET administrator has such long experience running youth programs, it has only been necessary for the prime sponsor to maintain one staff member to oversee youth programs. This staff member has worked closely with the CYET administrator. Intake of all youth and adult participants and recruitment of all job sites is handled by CYET, keeping administrative costs to a minimum. On the average, only 2% of the budget goes to administrative costs. Coordination between out-of-school and in-school programs occurs such that potential dropouts are identified and switched to an out-of-school program that best meets their needs. The CYET administrator supervises all in-school career teachers and out-of-school vocational education counselors. Out-of-school programs are monitored by CYET and the prime youth director and one program was dropped for poor performance.

Linkages with LEA

Reasons for the excellent prime sponsor/LEA relationship include:

(1) the excellent record of CYET with youth programs; (2) the personal relationship between the CYET administrator and prime youth director, who is a former CYET youth participant; and (3) the support of the mayor who is a former member of the school board. An indication of LEA commitment to youth programs is the fact that all rent and almost all teacher and vocational education counselor salaries for in-school and out-of-school programs are provided by LEA.

There has been some friction between the CYET and other sectors of the LEA. Although the CYET administrator began in the LEA as a teacher in 1955 and has run CYET since 1965, the school system was slow to give him recognition. Recently the school system received YETP funding which it chose to administer separately from CYET, thereby resulting in duplicative administrative costs.

The State of Minnesota established an educational linkages office with state CETA money, and this office has helped to promote the idea of CETA/LEA linkages.

Private Sector

The private sector has had little involvement with youth programs and private sector job sites are not used in this program. But the vast majority of job sites are at small agencies where a one-to-one relationship of site supervisor and participant is assured. Ninety percent of work sites have been working with CYET for 15 years. Attempts to use VEPS (Vocational Exploration at Private Sector Sites) in the past have been unsuccessful, since the students didn't want to shadow workers and businesses didn't like having the students around.

Staff

CYET staff is about 1/3 minority, reflecting the population served. On-site supervisors are never paid. Union teachers are interviewed before placement in CYET and voluntarily work longer hours. The CYET administrator felt it takes two years for career teachers to become truly effective, but has had minimal staff turnover. A critical part of operations is a weekly staff meeting.

SAN FRANCISCO

Introduction

The Prime Sponsor for San Francisco is the consolidated County and City of San Francisco. The City has a population of 645,000, with 49% white, 16% black, 14% Hispanic and 20% Asian. Major businesses include tourism, finance, insurance, real estate, medical and governmental services. There is much in and out of city movement for jobs in the Bay Area, but the majority of job openings are heavily concentrated in service industries.

A very active network of community organizations representing the wide range of ethnic groups in the city has had a strong impact on the allocation of out of school monies. A large number of non-English speaking people has resulted in a strong emphasis on literacy and ESL training through use of Title IIb and IV monies. The Mayor's Office of Employment and Training is responsible for planning, evaluation, and assessments of all participants.

The impact of Proposition 13 can be felt in both the schools and City government. Supportive services and counseling, which in the past had been paid for with school aids, are no longer provided unless picked up with CETA funds. Over 600 school employers were laid off in the last year and the coming year doesn't seem as if it will be much better.

Out-of-School

The City subcontracts all out-of-school money to twenty subcontractors which provide literacy training, OJT or career employment experience. The success of the programs is due in part to the smaller number of clients served (30 per cent) from special need populations, and the fact that CBO's recruit and select their own clients.

Contracts are competitive and careful review of performance dictates renewal of training contracts for the new year. Program participants are required to take the same standardized test and pre-post scores are required for measuring performance during program orientation.

A good example of this is the Youth for Service CBO program which operates a 14 week literacy training for 33 participants. Of the 180 who applied, 60 showed up a second time to complete the pre-test and after another scheduled interview, 33 were selected. Of the 33, 24 got their GED's at the end of the 14 weeks. A program with an informal atmosphere but a high degree of structure combined classroom instruction with a strong counseling program. (12-15 per class) Teachers were selected from the City College who had previous experience with youth. Classes were held 4 hours/day five days a week with a stipend for attendance. The budget was \$51,000 for the program. In addition to the two teachers, three counselors acted as peer advisors to participants. These counselors, generally only one or two years older than the participants they advise, were recruited from the City College or University. They assisted in classroom instruction, offered supportive services and did home visits. Home visits and counseling were seen as essential to regular attendance and performance by participants.

Because of state law which requires all students to remain in school until 18, and demands that all education programs be certified by the LEA, only 10%

of the YETP population is under 18. Most are 18-21. Half of the CBO programs stress literacy instruction. The city has made literacy the priority for youth programs in this year's and next year's programs.

In-School

The San Francisco Unified School District is the operator of an in-school program which serves over 900 participants. Academic credit for work is awarded for students who enroll in a related course. About 60% of enrollees take academic work. Career workshops are also conducted twice a semester for 2 hours per session. During FY 79 the LEA did career workshops for CBO's as well as school based youth. This year CBO's are doing their own in preference to smaller classes.

Four teacher/advisors supervise worksites, counsel students (200!) and recommend remedial education for participants. Teacher/advisors divided their time among 11 high schools to provide additional career information and counseling to individuals.

During the regular school year, a student may not work if absent from school on the same day. Many CBO's have complained, however, that it is often a month before they receive attendance data. In fact, unless the CBO's or other worksites are contacted immediately, there can be little enforcement of the school/work requirement.

Linkages

The Mayor's Office of Employment and Training (MOET) operates the Youth Service Office (YSO) which has provided centralized intake and assessment for all youth programs. YSO can test and assess youths interested in training activities. The test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) is used as the pre- and post-test for evaluation of programs and clients. Those with job skills can receive placement services and those requiring training can be sent to the appropriate training agency based upon their individual needs. As the Central Coordinating Office, the YSO can inform and refer youths to all the training opportunities available under YFOPA and non-CETA resources developed through linkages with other youth serving agencies.

A grant from the Governor's Office allows the Employment Development Department (EDD) of the State of California to operate the YSO with the prime sponsor. EDD labor market information is provided for eligible and non-eligible youth. Career counseling and placement are provided for non eligible youth.

By sharing resources and housing, EDD and the prime are able to more effectively attract youth to the services and EDD is able to increase the quality of its counseling and placement services for youth by having a special office geared to the specific needs of youth.

The Prime has been the innovator in any changes which have occurred in youth programs. A staff over 200 with 20 people in youth services allows the prime to take an active role in intervening in the education/work linkage. The head of the youth monitoring unit for MOET works closely with the head of SFUSO Youth Employment to assure coordination of services and cooperation with CBO's. Funding for the LEA includes 22% set aside, plus an additional 15% under IIB as work experience.

Staff

During the regular school year, the LEA operates with the direction from Teacher/Advisors and youth workers. Teacher/Advisors are all credentialed counselors who have been in the program five to seven years and who have had previous experience.

During the summer program, the LEA program coordinator meets with the supervisors of each home school Teacher/Advisor daily. These supervisors then hold regular meetings with teacher advisors assigned to them.

Prime Sponsor staff has over 20 staff in the youth division, in addition to regular planning and administrative staff. One fourth of the employees of the Youth Division had previous experience with a CBO. The effectiveness of the YSO seems a direct result of the rapport staff have been able to establish with participating CBO's and cooperating institutions.

SEATTLE

Introduction

The Prime Sponsor for the Seattle area is the King Snohomish Manpower Consortium (KSMC), serving King and Snohomish Counties. KSMC subcontracts with the Seattle Public Schools for all in-school youth in the city and with the

City of Seattle for all out-of-school youth. KSMC is a planning and coordinating agency which does not provide any direct services. Funds are allocated to the school system and city through a fair share formula based on census and dropout data.

KSMC is a Tier II Entitlement program. Instrumental in obtaining the monies were the mayor of Seattle and the King County Executive, who forced involvement of KSMC staff who were resistant to the entitlement effort.

In-School Program

The Seattle Public Schools run the Work Training Program, an in-school program for 700 kids. YETP funds 300 primarily 14-15 year olds while Entitlement funds 400 16-19 year olds. The same program exists for both YETP and YIEPP students. Seventeen counselors work closely with worksite supervisors and students to provide career information, transition services, supervision of attendance and performance and supportive services. Students must be attending school and passing at least one class to be in the Work Training Program.

Eleven counselors are located centrally and six are located at specific schools. The school administration is suggesting that the entire counseling unit be school based. Counselors at specific schools work with teachers, monitor attendance and provide supportive services on site or at the school.

Most counselors have had little if any counseling experience, yet they argue that they do more work and supportive services than the regular high school counselor who may see the kid once a year and not even know the child is in a work experience program.

A counselor's most important role is to provide the linkage between the supervisor and student, and to provide employment and career counseling. Heavy stress on counseling and support services can be seen in the \$2,500 per client costs with more than 40% overhead.

Out-of-School

The City of Seattle's Division of Human Resources Department of Youth Employment Services operates the Youth Work Training Project (YWTP) which is responsible for serving all out-of-school youth in the city of Seattle. Currently 218 dropouts are being served through YWTP. The current program began in late 1968 as an NYC II Project. Later the program was funded by YETP and now by YCCIP and YIEPP as well.

Under YETP students are paid 40 hours a week, including 20 hours for attending school and 20 hours for work experience. Education is provided at the YWTP by LEA teachers. The curriculum and staff are supervised by the LEA, but work closely with the city. Teachers are regular certified staff paid with LEA funds.

The success of the program rests on a strong counseling program and supportive services. The counseling ratio is 1:35. Clients are seen at least once a week, usually daily because the whole program operates out of the same building. In addition, each week one of the five counselors meets with all the teachers and job developers for an hour to discuss their caseload. As a result, every five weeks a counselor is able to discuss each client's progress with the whole staff. Supportive services are provided through the State Employment Security Department which also provides certification and assessment, by contract through KSMC. Supportive services provided include: transportation, day care, dental care, rent vouchers for emergencies, and employment counseling. Assessment is also done through Employment Security and includes reading and math testing (Gates-McGinnity), and placement in a program. Thirty percent are below a 4th grade reading level and another 60% between the 4th and 8th grade level. Special attention is provided to basic skills in the education curriculum.

Supervision of worksites by counselors is done every six weeks by the counselor and job developer. A full evaluation of performance is done every three months.

Overall per client costs are \$3,537. Cost per positive outcome is \$7,296 with a 40% positive exit rate. About 1/3 of the youth budget goes for services and administration. Some of the problems are: the YETP 40 hour program is in competition with the Entitlement program which doesn't pay you to go to school. The city would prefer to do their own supportive services and assessment, rather than Employment Security.

Cooperation with City/LEA

The out-of-school program (YETP) run by the city has been the result of many years of back scratching between the public schools and city hall. The city gets the services of regular trained teachers without the expense of running their own school. The schools get increased state aids for dropouts who enter the city's YETP plus rent for use of the school building.

The program works because the kids get paid to go to school, as well as to go to work. The large amount of money for services and administration fits into KSMC's commitment to serving out-of-school youth.

Private Sector

There has been limited success with private sector employment. Only 15-20 jobs are now private. These are all in smaller light manufacturing, for example, electronic assembly.

APPENDIX A

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adams, A. and Mangum, The Lingering Crisis of Youth Unemployment (Kalamazoo: W.E. Upjohn Institute, 1978).
2. Andrisani, Paul J., "The Establishment of Stable and Successful Employment Careers: The Role of Work Attitudes and Labor Market Knowledge", in Conference Report on Youth Unemployment: Its Measurement and Meaning (U.S. Department of Labor, 1978).
3. Andrisani, Paul J., Work Attitudes and Labor Market Experience: Evidence from the National Longitudinal Surveys (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1978).
4. Bachman, J.G., Green, S., and Wirtanen, I.D., Dropping Out - Problem or or Symptom, Vol. 3 of Youth in Transition (University of Michigan, 1971).
5. Card, J.J. and Wise, L.L., "Teenage Mothers and Teenage Fathers: The Impact of Early Childbearing on the Parents' Personal and Professional Lives", Family Planning Perspectives (1978).
6. Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, Giving Youth a Better Chance: A Report with Recommendations (Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1979).
7. Chilman, C., "Possible Factors Associated with Higher Out-of-Marriage Births Among Adolescents", paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., 1976.
8. Congressional Budget Office, Budget Options for the Youth Employment Problem (Washington, D.C.: Congress of the United States, 1977).
9. Congressional Budget Office, Youth Unemployment: The Outlook and Some Policy Strategies (Washington, D.C.: Congress of the United States, April, 1978).
10. Copperman, Paul, The Literacy Hoax: The Decline of Reading, Writing and Learning in the Public Schools and What We Can Do About It (New York: William Morrow and Co., Inc., 1978).
11. Education and Work, Two Worlds or One?: The Issues and a Colloquium, (Change Magazine Press, July, 1979).
12. Entitlement Bulletin, (Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, 1979).
13. Gess, Larry, "Towards a National Youth Development Policy" in Youth Unemployment: Solving the Problem (American Vocational Association, 1978).

14. Harmon, David and Inter, Carmen St. John, Adult Illiteracy in the United States: A Report to the Ford Foundation (McGraw-Hill, 1979).
15. Henry, William and Miles, Guy, An Analysis of the Occupational Adjustment of Spanish-Surname Youth from the Rural Southwest (North Star Research Institute, September, 1974).
16. Hoyt, Kenneth B., "LEA/CETA: Collaboration for Career Education - A Series of Fifteen Mini-Conferences" (Washington, D.C., 1979).
17. Hoyt, Kenneth B., "YEDPA and Career Education", Monographs on Career Education, Office of Career Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Washington, D.C., May, 1978).
18. Hoyt, Kenneth B., "YEDPA: Obligations and Opportunities for American Education", Remarks prepared for presentation at DOL/HEW YEDPA workshops for CETA Prime Sponsors and LEAS (December, 1977 and January, 1978).
19. Jencks, Christopher, Inequality, A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America (New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1972).
20. Jensen, Gary F., "Race, Achievement and Delinquency: A Further Look at Delinquency in a Birth Cohort", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 82 (September, 1976).
21. Killingsworth, Charles C. and Killingsworth, Mark R., "Direct Effects of Employment and Training Programs on Employment and Unemployment: New Estimates and Implications for Employment Policy" in Conference Report on Youth Unemployment: Its Measurement and Meaning (U.S. Department of Labor, 1978).
22. Kvaraceus, W., "Reading: Failure and Delinquency" in Discipline in the Classroom (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1974).
23. Levin, Martin A., "Improving the Implementation of YEDPA Programs", Brandeis University, Unpublished Report.
24. Mangum, Garth L. and Walsh, John, Employment and Training Programs for Youth: What Works Best for Whom, A Report to the Office of Youth Programs (May, 1978).
25. Mangum, Garth L. Career Education and the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (Washington, D.C.: Office of Career Education, February, 1978).
26. Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, "A Preliminary Estimate of the Impact of Youth Entitlement on School Behavior", Prepared by Sheila Mandel and Loren Solnick, October, 1979.

27. Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation, "Schooling and Work Among Youths from Low-Income Households", prepared by Suzanne Barclay, Christine Bottom, George Farkas, Ernst W. Strober, and Randall J. Olsen, April 9, 1979.
28. Manpower and Vocational Education Weekly, Vol. 11, No. 4, January 24, 1980.
29. National Association of State Boards of Education, CETA/YEDPA Education Policy Issues and Recommendations (Washington, D.C., 1979).
30. National Institute of Education, The Career Intern Program: Final Report, Vol. I and II (Washington, D.C., May, 1977).
31. Nation's Schools Report, Vol. 6, No. 1, January 14, 1980.
32. New York Times, "Jobs for Youth: New Proposals for an Old Problem", March 9, 1980.
33. New York Times, "Inner City Schools Show Signs of Progress", January 6, 1980.
34. New York Times, "A New York Experiment Seems to be Promising", March 9, 1980.
35. Notes from the Joint Economic Committee, Vol. V, No. 19 (Congress of the United States, December 27, 1979).
36. Parnes, H.S., "Improved Job Information: Its Impact on Long-Run Labor Market Experience" in Seymour L. Wolfbein, ed., Labor Market Information for Youths (Philadelphia: Temple University, 1975).
37. Pines, Marion and Morlock, James, "Ceta Program Models: Work Experience Perspectives", Office of Manpower Research and Development Monograph, Department of Labor, 1977.
38. Polk, Kenneth and Halferty, David, "School Cultures, Adolescent Commitments and Delinquency", Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 4 (July, 1966).
39. Sticht, T. and McFann, H., "Reading Requirements for Career Entry", in D.M. Nielsen and H.G. Hjelme's Reading and Career Education (International Reading Association, 1975).
40. Taggart, Robert and Rosenberg, Janet, "Entitlement: Experimental, Intense and Unique", in Trio for Youth (U.S. Department of Labor, September, 1979).
41. Tyler, R.W., From School to Work: Improving the Transition, U.S. Commission of Manpower Policy (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976).
42. U.S. Department of Labor, Impacts of YEDPA on Education/CETA Relationships at the Local Level: Five Case Studies, Employment and Training Administration, Office of Youth Programs (Washington, D.C., August, 1978).

43. U.S. Department of Labor, Worksite Activity Under the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act: An Interim Report, Employment and Training Administration, Office of Youth Programs (Washington, D.C., August, 1978).
44. U.S. General Accounting Office, Difficulties of the Neighborhood Youth Corps In-School Program and Its Management Problems: Report to the Congress (Washington, D.C., 1973).
45. Vice President's Task Force on Youth Employment, A Review of Youth Employment Problems, Programs, and Policies, V. 1. 1 and 2 (Washington, D.C., January, 1980).
46. Vice President's Task Force on Youth Employment, A Summary Report, U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Youth Programs (Washington, D.C., 1980).
47. Weber, A.R., "Comments by Arnold Weber" in Creating Jobs, J.L. Palmer, ed. (Washington, D.C., 1978).
48. Wurzburg, Gregory, Improving Job Opportunities for Youth: A Review of Prime Sponsor Experience in Implementing the Youth Employment and Demonstration Projects Act, National Council on Employment Policy (August, 1978).
49. Wurzburg, Gregory and Colmen, Joseph, Involving Schools in Employment and Training Programs for Youth (May, 1979).
50. Wurzburg, Gregory, Youth and the Local Employment Agenda, National Council on Employment Policy (Washington, D.C., January, 1980).
51. You and Youth, A Monthly Newsletter published by Vocational Foundation, Inc., Vol. 1, No. 3, August, 1979.
52. You and Youth, A Monthly Newsletter published by Vocational Foundation, Inc., Vol. 1, No. 6, November, 1979.
53. Youth Programs, A Publication of the Center for Public Service, Brandeis University, September, 1979.
54. Youthwork, Inc., On the Education and Employment of High Risk Youth: Public Forum, February 2, 1979 (Washington, D.C.).
55. Youthwork National Policy Study, Education and Employment Training: The Views of Youth, Interim Report #2, Ray Rist, Principal Investigator (Cornell University, November, 1979).
56. Youthwork National Policy Study, Forging New Relationships: The CETA/School Nexus, Interim Report #1, Ray Rist, Principal Investigator (Cornell University, June, 1978).

57. Youthwork National Policy Study, Strategies for Coordinating Education and Employment Services: A Preliminary Analysis of Four In-School Alternatives Ray Rist, Principal Investigator (Cornell University, November, 1979).
58. U.S. Department of Labor, Youth, Employment and Training Administration (Washington, D.C., 1979).
59. U.S. Department of Labor, A Knowledge Development Plan for Youth Initiatives Fiscal 1979, Employment and Training Administration, Office of Youth Programs (Washington, D.C., 1978).
60. U.S. Department of Labor, Completing the Youth Agenda: A Plan for Knowledge Development, Dissemination, and Application for Fiscal 1980, Employment and Training Administration, Office of Youth Programs (Washington, D.C. October, 1979).
61. Council of the Great City Schools, Final Report on the Youth Employment Assistance Project (Washington, D.C.: January, 1980).
62. Council of the Great City Schools, Youth Employment Training Programs and the Urban School, Prepared by The Youth Employment Assistance Project (Washington, D.C. August, 1979).

APPENDIX B

ORGANIZATIONS PROVIDING INFORMATION OR ASSISTANCE

American Council of Education
American Vocational Association
Center for Public Service, Brandeis University
Chief State School Officers
Corporation for Public/Private Ventures
Department of Labor, Office of Youth Programs, and 6 Regional Youth Offices
Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration
Department of Labor, Technical Assistance Division
Florida Governor's Grant Office
49 State Offices of Employment and Training
Jobs for Youth
MDRC
Minnesota Department of Education
National Association of Counties
National Association of State Boards of Education
National Conference of State Legislators
National Council of Great City Schools
National Council on Employment Policy
National Governor's Association
National Institute of Education
National Office of Education, Bureau of Adult Vocational Education
National Office of Education, Office of Career Education

National Office of Education, Office of Joint Dissemination and Review Panel

National Office of Education, Office of Planning and Evaluation

National Office of Education, Policy Studies Department

Opportunities Industrialization Center (OIC)

Vice President's Task Force on Youth Employment

Youthwork, Inc.

Youthwork National Policy Study, Cornell University